

Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC teleconference 25th July 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=7741

~~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 July 11th Telecon

See: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/13534>

Call for AOB

None.

Action Review

- (TomM) Post revised draft of RMD specification. Carried Fwd from June 27th.
- (Bryan) Remove issue 117 (replaced by 123). **Done**
- (Bryan) Move issue 118 to open. **Done**
- (Bryan) Remove issue 121. **Done**
- (Bryan) Move issue 122 to closed, no action. **Done.**
- (Bryan) Move issue 123 to open. **Done.**
- (Bryan) Reopen issue 110. **Done**
- (Bryan) Move issue 110 to resolved. **Done.**
- (TomM) Write new text for resolution to issue wsrif 118. (cut/copy/paste for RMD to go in AppNotes.) Carried Fwd from June 27th.
- (Bryan) Move issue 119 to resolved. **Done.**
- (Bryan) Move issue 120 to resolved. **Done**
- (Bryan) Create new issue (ws-addr schemaLocation trailing “/”) with a state of “resolved”. **Done**
- (Tim) Distributed updated primer which removes requirement on issue 123. **Done**

(William) Distribute scenario description that motivates issue 123 independent of the primer. **Done**

(DaveS) We need to enhance the resolution process to enable resolutions to go into the public report at the end of the public review process.

(MartinC) Anything that is published after public review means we must publicize the differences compared to the reviewed version.

(DaveS) That's what the report is for.

New issues to consider - Bryan

(DaveS) These are issues from the public comment and are all open. We'll cover them later.

Issue Review

Issue WSRF123: Need a facility to handle collections of ResourceProperties

(TimB) We should review section 3 of the new version of the Primer recently posted here:

http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/download.php/13744/WSRF_Primer%5B5%5D.doc

The third example is a version of the shopping cart with WS Resources representing the Items in the cart.

(DaveS) So the constituent Items are separate resources.

(TimB) Yes, this is the resolution of issues 123 done as application-level wsdl/xsd and without changing any of the specs.

(DaveS) The AddItem operation returns an EPR to the new Item which allows you to talk to the item. So this is a nested version of the first example?

(TimB) Yes. It's a more complex document structure.

(TimB) The last example is a group of printers and jobs based on serviceGroup

(DaveS) It's a serviceGroup with two membership rules, allowing printers and jobs in,

(TimB) Yes.

(DaveS) So it's not that each printer has a servicegroup of jobs, but, rather that printers and jobs are modeled at the same 'level' - i.e. without a printer 'enveloping' a number of jobs.

(DaveS) We need some volunteers to read the primer.

Action: (Jem/RogerM) Review the latest draft of the Primer.

Any objections to closing issue 123 as described?

None.

Action: (Bryan) Move to closed.

(DaveS) One of the possibilities for resolving issue 123 was to allow the MemberServiceEPR to be an optional element. We need to decide whether to raise this as an issue. William posted requirements here: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200507/msg00008.html> describing a ServiceGroup which didn't provide access to the member services. Are there any objections to making this an issue?

None.

Action: (Bryan) Create and open a new issue.

(TomM) I'm Ok with it, but I think ServiceGroup will be more complicated.

(DaveS) And serviceGroup is difficult already.

(TomM) I know how to make the syntax changes, but the changes in the semantics are difficult to describe.

(Bryan) It could be that the whole RP doc is in the serviceGroup, so access to the member is not necessary.

(DaveS) We could simply include an EPR which is not useable. This is similar to providing visibility to a ResourceProperty which a particular user can't set.

(Bryan) This would force the implementation to make up the EPRs.

(DaveS) The problem is that this is a ServiceGroup, and services have EPRs. If what you're modeling is not services, then maybe serviceGroup is not the thing to be using, which was the route taken in the resolution to issue 123.

(TomM) I propose we close with no action.

(TimB) Seconded.

(DaveS) Any objections?

(BryanM) Is it an option for William (not present) to reopen the issue if he feels strongly?

(DaveS) Ok, but it needs stronger use cases to motivate it.

Action: (Bryan) Move to Close with no action.

(DaveS) We need to consider comments from the public review. Note that these are prefixed 'PR Comment'.

Issue WSRF125: PR Comment – Wording change for requirement 1

(TomM) This is about whether the GED defines the type, or whether it's the complexType that does it.

(DaveS) The wording should change the beginning of the sentence that starts in line 330 to: 'This GED refers to the complexType of....'

(DaveS) Any objections?

None.

Action: (Bryan) Move to Resolved.

Issue WSRF126: PR Comment – Question of intent for requirement 2

(DaveS) If the element is a GED, it's already uniquely identified by qname. We could fold this in with requirement 1.

(JemT) We could say that 'It follows that...'

(DaveS) Right. So we remove the separate point that distinguishes requirement 2 and change this to say 'It follows that...' Any objections?

No objections.

Action: (Bryan) Move to Resolved.

Issue WSRF127: PR Comment – Why MUST for "Resource Action Pattern"?

(Bryan) This is pointed out on the GetResourcePropertyDocument operation, but applies to all the operations.

(DaveS) This asks for clarification of what it means to follow the interop requirements of the Resource Access Pattern.

(Bryan) Since we removed all embodiments except for WS-Addressing, all this means is that one must follow the rules of WS-Addressing.

(DaveS) I don't think it states that one must use WS-Addressing, but there are no interoperability issues in just using an EPR. So the issue is correct: the 'MUST' seems superfluous. However, I would like to hear other opinions on this.

(TomM) We took out some requirements of the RAP.

(BryanM) The question is whether the text on line 372 adds anything. I don't think so. Can we just remove the sentence?

(DaveS) That would be the proposed recommendation. But can we make it non-normative and still reference WS-RAP?

(Bryan) Then we don't need that document.

(DaveS) We need an action item to assess the implications of removing this 'MUST' and similar reference (in other specs) to WS-RAP. Does this remove all references to WS-RAP and make that doc non-normative?

Action: (DaveS/MartinC) Do the review.

Issue WSRF128: PR Comment – multiplicity of response in the pseudo-schema for GetResourceProperty

Action: (Bryan) The title should be changed to "...pseudo-schema for GetResourcePropertyDocument"

(DaveS) The response to a GetResourcePropertyDocument must always include the root element of the Resource Property document. We should close the issue with no action. Any objections?

None.

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

Issue WSRF129: PR Comment – clarify description of the contents of the response to GetResourceProperty

Action: (Bryan) The title should be changed to "...pseudo-schema for GetResourcePropertyDocument"

(TomM) Do we want to talk about the implications of access control?

(DaveS) No, we don't talk about any security requirements (or associated faults) in the specs. The statement about the response in the spec is right. There may be reasons why it might fault, the only fault we identify is ResourceUnknown.

(TomM) We're not saying this is an exhaustive list of faults.

(DaveS) What the spec says is that the WS resource should either send the right response message or a fault. Other faults could be defined.

(Bryan) But the thinking behind the issue is wrong. We don't need this Access Denied Fault because the operation should not be offered to client's which can't reply with the whole document. However, we lead the reader down the wrong road in line 391. We should change it to recommend not offering the operation if the user can't get the whole document.

(DaveS) Maybe we could do this in the primer or AppNotes.

(Bryan) But we should add guidance about clients that don't have access to the whole doc.

(DaveS) Well, it could be that a user gets only some of the RP document (eg only a particular users jobs), but not all of it.

There are two steps here: the issue is resolvable with no action, since the spec is unambiguous with careful reading of 387-390 and 391-2.

(TomM) I propose closing with no action.

(Tim) Seconded.

No objections.

Action (Bryan) close with no action.

(DaveS) We can decide later whether to help further by putting put the resolution text in AppNotes or Primer.

Straggler Roll Call & Close

Closed 13:23 Eastern time

Next telecon is on August 8th.

Summary of actions

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

(TomM) Write new text for resolution to issue wsrf 118. (cut/copy/paste for RMD to go in AppNotes.) Carried Fwd from June 27th.

(Jem/RogerM) Review the latest draft of the Primer.

(Bryan) Move issue 123 to Closed.

(Bryan) Create new issue describing optional MemberEPR in ServiceGroupEntry and move to closed, no action.

(Bryan) Move issues 125 and 126 to resolved.

(DaveS/MartinC) Issue 127: review implication of removing every operation's obligation to follow Resource Access Pattern.

(Bryan) Change titles of issues 128 & 129 be changed to "...pseudo-schema for GetResourcePropertyDocument"

(Bryan) Move issue 128 to closed, no action, but with explanation.

(Bryan) Move issue 129 to closed, no action, but with explanation.