

# Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC Face-to-Face meeting 27<sup>th</sup> June 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/wsrif/event.php?event\\_id=7739](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrif/event.php?event_id=7739)

NB: The meeting is not quorate, not having the necessary 50% of voting members.

## ***Confirm minute taker***

Tim Banks is taking the minutes.

## ***Approve of minutes of June 13<sup>th</sup> Telecon***

See: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/13216>

There were comments and no objections.

## ***Call for AOB***

(IanR) Conversion of members to voting members has taken place. Conversion of observers to non-voting members to allow contributions to be made can be achieved via a note to one of the co-chairs.

## ***Action Review***

(Sam) To post PR version Basefaults. **Done**

(Steve G) Raise new issue for further relaxation of RPDoc constraints. Carried fwd from 6th June. Carry fwd.

(IanR) I suggest removing this as an action, and awaiting a real issue.  
No Objections.

(Tim) Post description of new issue to the list, describing gap in the framework with potential resolution in SG. **Done.** (Issue 123).

(Bryan) Raise this new issue as 'open' **Done.**

(TomM) Raise new issue to describe the equivalent of cut/copy/paste for metadata. **Done.** (Issue 118)

(TomM) Raise new issue to discuss the name of the metadata container and its extensibility capability beyond RP documents. **Done** (Issue 119)

(Bryan) Raise this issue as 'Open'. **Done**

(TomM/Bryan) Write issue proposal for metadata descriptors to refer to GED and have open attribute content. (& Move to open) (See below)

(TomM) Post revised draft of specification. **Carry Fwd.**

### ***New issues to consider - Bryan***

WS-A URL: <http://www.oasis->

[open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200506/msg00043.html](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200506/msg00043.html)

reopen 110 - <http://www.oasis->

[open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200506/msg00051.html](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200506/msg00051.html)

(Bryan) Issue 117 will be replaced by issue 123 from recent email: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200506/msg00058.html>

**Action:** (Bryan) Remove issue 117

Issue 118 (cut/copy/paste for metadata.): from last week's minutes (corresponds to email <http://www.oasis->

[open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200506/msg00061.html](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200506/msg00061.html) )

(IanR) It should be Appnotes that is affected.

(Bryan) Right

(IanR) We need to move this from proposed to open when we are quorate.

(Bryan) New issue 119 is about the name of metadata container and extensibility. It is open per last week's minutes.

[New attendees means the meeting is now quorate.]

(Bryan) Can we open issue 118 now?

(IanR) Are there any objections to issue 118 being opened?

No Objections.

**Action:** (Bryan) Move issue 118 to open.

(Bryan) Issue 120 is confusing. (global elements decls and open attribute content). Is it about open attribute content?

(TomM) I didn't recognize it from the minutes.

(TimB) There were to be three new issues, perhaps last weeks minutes didn't describe them correctly.

(TomM) The issue is about the ability to path into sub-portions of Resource Properties vs restricting to qnames to simplify the RMD specification.

(Bryan) Is this what I created as issue 120 (Describe rules for overlapping descriptors in metadata)?

(TomM) Yes, that's it.

(TimB) So I will update last week's minutes to reflect this issue title.

(Bryan) This issue is open as per last week's minutes.

(Bryan) Issue 121 is about RPDoc constraints, and we've agreed to remove that pending a new issue from Steve.

**Action:** (Bryan) Remove issue 121.

(BryanM) Issue 122, says the reference to WS Addressing was incorrect.

(TomM) I thought I allayed the concerns that the uri will be the stable reference for the V1 namespace.

(IanR) I would be surprised if the uri remained the same through a V1 to V2 revision.

(TomM) That was the case (it did change) for Xpath.

(IanR) If we're wrong in our understanding of WS-Addressing versioning, then we'll have to change, but right now this isn't a problem. I propose we should close with no further action.

(TomM) Seconded. I will forward Hiro's response...actually it's at 21 June at 6:27 he sent a response, but the email address got mixed up. Hiro says everything is ok if the w3C naming convention is as Tom expects.

(IanR) Please can the response be forwarded to the list?

(TomM) Ok.

No objections.

**Action:** (Bryan) Move to closed, no action.

(Bryan) Issue 123 is about collections, and the minutes from last meeting say it should be open.

(IanR) Right, Any objections?

(TomM) I think the proposal is orthogonal to the issue.

(TimB) The issue we agreed was about the gap between ResourceProperties and a Members of a ServiceGroup. We also discussed one way to fix it which is described in the issue. We should open it and discuss resolution when we review the issue.

(TomM) I think the removal of a memberService is a bit tortured, but the issue is worthy of discussion.

(IanR) Any objections to moving this to open?

No objections.

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

(Bryan) Also there is a discussion about reopening issue 110.

(IanR) Issue 110 is about adding open content to the base fault type, which means that schema validation breaks. Are there any objections to reopening this?

No Objections.

**Action:** (Bryan) Reopen Issue 110.

## ***Issue review – Chair***

### **WSRF110 Base Faults extensibility**

(IanR) What are the three options for solving the original problem?

(TomM) There were originally three options for resolving this issue.

- Remove the extensibility from base faults- closing issue 100 with no action
- Remove the extensibility element prior to a required element to make it deterministic.
- Wrapper the extensibility within another element.

(IanR) Which of these supports the original requirement?

(Bryan) One requirement is a generic fault handler, another is the desire to add additional elements. A generic Fault handler is possible via xml 'extends' without adding additional

elements such as stack trace via extensibility that aren't defined within the fault type.

(IanR) If one uses xml 'extends', then surely the baseFault type can be extended, and we become non-deterministic wrt the UPA constraint.

(TomM) If the any extension point went above the timestamp, then the 'any' would be distinguishable.

(IanR) Doesn't 'extends' require new elements to be added at the end.

(TomM) Yes.

(IanR) So as long as any isn't at the end the ambiguity is removed.

(TomM) Yes.

(IanR) ..but there would be no access to the elements beyond 'any' by a generic handler nor cope with xml 'extends' if those elements go at the end.

(TomM) If processing=lax, then you don't have access to extended elements through the 'any'. Right?

(IanR) How would I write a generic handler?

(BryanM) The handler might not know the exact detailed type, but it could still generically process the basic fields.

(BryanM) We need to talk about the two things separately.

(TomM) Yes: generic fault handling and basefault extensions.

(IanR) of the three proposals: 1) Doesn't give extensibility of the core basefault type. What is the shortcoming of moving the 'any' earlier? Or of Wrapping it with an element that has minOccurs=0.

(TomM) I think they both achieve the same thing: it only deals with elements that are deterministically added. The extra stuff can't be accessed.

(IanR) So neither option 2 or 3 solve the problem. So we can pick the one we like better, or drop the modification to baseFault

(Bryan) I didn't want to insist that we had access to the extensions. What I want is that a handler can handle generic faults. Option 2 or 3 is acceptable, but 2 is aesthetically better.

(TomM) Agreed.

(IanR) Are there any objections to moving the 'any' to be the first element in the baseFault (since there is only one required element).

(BryanM) Other specs put extensibility point first for this same reason.

(IanR) So the proposal is option 2. Any objections?

No Objections.

**Action:** (BryanM) Move issue 110 to resolved.

### **WSRF118: How do you cut/copy/paste portions of metadata**

(IanR) We should discuss this on the basis of a proposal for new text.

**Action:** (TomM) Write new text.

### **WSRF119: What should we name the metadata container, and does it need extensibility?**

(TomM) If we call this PropertyMetadataDescriptor with extensibility, how do we circumscribe the possibilities for extension.

(IanR) We would be giving them a way to do property metadata, but is this insufficient. Ie, what do we lose by not having the extensibility, and how difficult is it to explain if it's there?

(TomM) We could put extensibility into the property element instead of in the container, so the extensibility has to be about the property rather than other things.

(IanR) That sounds good. Anyone else have feelings about it.

(Bryan) Since we are only talking about metadata for properties, it seems the container should only allow property metadata.

(TomM) Right. That sounds like agreement.

(IanR) What's the resolution?

(TomM) The action would be to rename metadataDescriptor to resourcePropertyMetadataDescriptor, and remove extensibility from it and add extensibility to the property element which is a child sequence of RPMD.

(IanR) Any Objections.

None.

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

### **WSRF120: Describe rules for overlapping descriptors in metadata.**

(TomM) This is straightforward if the rules are about QName references. Ie drop pathing, use QName references and open attribute content. This makes things much simpler.

(IanR) This is an issue because we hadn't captured this in the review of RMD, yes?

(TomM) Yes. In the non-quorum discussions, we decided it would be simpler to drop pathing portion of property metadata. So we needed to bring it to the TC.

(IanR) I think we talked about it on the last call (or the one before). Does anyone think we need more discussion?

No-One.

(IanR) The proposed resolution is to drop the pathing and have open attribute content which can be used to do extensibility. Any Objections?

None.

**Action:** (Bryan) Move issue 120 to resolved.

## ***Straggler Roll Call & Close***

Closed 13:04 Eastern time

Next telecon is on July 11<sup>th</sup>.

## ***Summary of actions***

(TomM) Post revised draft of specification. Carried Fwd from June 27th.

(Bryan) Remove issue 117 (replaced by 123).

(Bryan) Move issue 118 to open.

(Bryan) Remove issue 121.

(Bryan) Move issue 122 to closed, no action.

(Bryan) Move issue 123 to open.

(Bryan) Reopen issue 110.

(Bryan) Move issue 110 to resolved.

(TomM) Write new text for resolution to issue wsrf 118. (cut/copy/paste for RMD to go in AppNotes.)

(Bryan) Move issue 119 to resolved.

(Bryan) Move issue 120 to resolved.