

# Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC teleconference 8<sup>th</sup> August 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=7742](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrif/event.php?event_id=7742)

## ***Confirm minute taker***

Tim Banks is taking the minutes.

## ***Approve of minutes of July 25<sup>th</sup> Telecon***

See: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/13762>

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

## ***Call for AOB***

None.

## ***Action Review***

(TomM) Post revised draft of RMD specification. Carried Fwd from July 25th.

(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. **Done**

(IanR) Was there enough feedback?

(TimB) There was a suggestion that we could consolidate the examples on a single scenario.

(IanR) I think there are four scenario types using the shopping cart and the printer. These are simple, and it would be hard to imagine a single scenario that would do the job.

(TimB) Right, it was hard to imagine a reasonable example for get/putResourceProperties document for the printer.

(DaveS) Right, if we tried to reduce it to one scenario, we don't have enough complexity with a single scenario.

(JemT) I didn't see any problem switching

(KirkW) The switching was confusing – the order could be better if it were printer properties, then simple shopping cart, complex shopping cart, then Printer service group.

(TimB) Well, the first section also deals with how WSRF puts identifiers in message headers – it would be confusing also to be dealing with complex operations at the same time. Perhaps the first example could be a simplified get/set property.

(IanR) Do subsequent sections follow ordering introduced in section 3?  
Yes.

(Bryan) Move issue 123 to Closed. (Carried fwd)

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

(IR comment: Dave S requested the issue (137) be reopened). **Done**

(Bryan) Move issues 125 and 126 to resolved. **Done**

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Issue WSRF138: Typo in title of section 5.1.1**

(IanR) Any objections to this being opened?

None

Action (Bryan) move to Open

### ***Issue review - Chair***

#### **WSRF137: Allow the MemberServiceEPR to be optional element in a ServiceGroup**

(William) One scenario is if the serviceGroup is behind a firewall, and the EPRs can't be exposed, but one wants to expose the status of Printers (toner etc) to suppliers. It needs to be done without giving direct access because there may be another way for the external users to get to the printer services. The problem is that if we don't make the EPR optional, then people will make up something bogus.

(IanR) What are the arguments against this proposal from two weeks ago?

(DaveS) The changes needed to make the EPR optional were extensive, and we would end up with a serviceGroup that has no services in it. A compromise is to say that the services must exist, but the exposure of the EPR is optional, but I haven't discussed this with Tom.

(TimB) What does it mean to say that a service must exist without there being an EPR? There is no normative meaning to the existence of the service.

(WiallimV) The fear is that people can use ServiceGroup without any service, but we need to make it clear that it really must be there. It's not something that can be verified, but this is just like a lot of other parts of the text.

(DaveS) Hopefully we can make the textual changes assuming the service exists, and only when we explain the MemberServiceEPR do we explain what optional means: it should exist, but isn't exposed.

(IanR) We don't need to make a big deal about the existence.

(DaveS) Right, we just imply it exists, but we're not exposing it.

(IanR) So the proposal is to make the change for optional EPRs. Do we have a seconder?

(?) Is there another example of how to use this?

(William) If access to resources is centralised in a registry, the installation might put a lookup key in the resourceProperties which goes into the serviceGroup, instead of an EPR.

(Fred) I'll second it.

(IanR) Any objections?

None.

(IanR) So this is resolved.

(TimB) I don't think we can move this directly to 'resolved' – we've resolved to work on a proposal.

(DaveS) We'll need to come back and verify it.

(IanR) We might uncover problems along the way, but the decision is clear.

(MartinC) Yes.

(SteveG) I think we need to analyse the implications of making it optional.

**Action:** (DaveS) Investigate the implications and work on precise language with Tom.

**Action:** (Bryan) move to resolved, but incorporate any implications for the spec from Dave/Tom.

#### **WSRF118: How do you cut/copy/paste portions of metadata from other interfaces into a new metadata document**

(IanR) We should skip this since Tom is not present.

#### **WSRF127: PR Comment – Why MUST for “Resource Action Pattern”?**

(IanR) There's been some email, exchanges about this. The action last time for Dave/Martin was to review the implication of removing the reference to RAP.

(DaveS) The action was to review the specs to see what effect there would be of removing refs to RAP. In fact, all the normative refs are those referred to in the public comment. So if we address the public comment, that's the whole story.

(IanR) So, what is the proposal?

(DaveS) The implied proposal was that we could delete WS-RAP from our specs, if we accept the fact that there is no interoperability problem resulting from the loss of 'MUST'.

(IanR) I think there is an interoperability problem: the RAP document is where the requirement for the identification of the resource in the message is explained. It normatively depends on WS-Addressing to provide the identification. Dave pointed out the singleton pattern, but this is covered by the case of an EPR where the identifier is part of the address. I made a proposal here: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200508/msg00003.html> to improve RAP because we removed too much detail when we moved text to AppNotes.

(William) I don't see why the identifier is needed: WSDL messages rarely have identifiers in them and the service/port is enough to identify the service. Another example

is WS-MetadataExchange can get WSDL for a Web service without having explicit requirements to carry an identifier.

(SteveG) Perhaps WS-Mex is not sufficiently specified?

(MartinC) I don't see why we need the indirection. We only use WS-Addressing.

(IanR) We need to say that we depend on WS-Addressing.

(MartinC) Right, but we don't need to talk about RAP, identifiers in messages and so on, we just need to say we use WS-Addressing to address resources.

(IanR) Right, that's what WS-RAP says.

(William) But why the level of indirection? Why not just say that we use WS-Addressing?

(DaveS) The public comment is asking about the use of 'MUST' wrt interoperability of messages. I think we mean the identifier must be in the message, not necessarily in the address.

(IanR) No, the use of the word 'message' means anywhere in the message.

(DaveS) In that case what is it that WS-RAP says, normatively?

(IanR) It says use WS-Addressing.

(DaveS) But a URL will do the trick: we say WS-Addressing is needed, but a URL will work.

(MartinC) I don't agree. A WS-Resource can't be accessed except by using WS-Addressing.

(DaveS) Well, life is easier if we all use WS-Addressing, but it's not an interoperability problem. We need to get this clear.

(William) I agree.

(SteveG) No – it's an interoperability issue. A WSDL document might contain portTypes etc etc and a Service element, but forgets to say that an EPR is really needed to access the service. The Service element might be for metadata exchange, for example. This would be an interoperability problem unless we have a statement explaining the semantic requirement to use an EPR. It's the combination of the WSDL and the SOAP header that makes the service work.

....

(MartinC) Are we still agreeing that EPRs are necessary?

(IanR) Yes. We have a public comment asking is we this is really an interoperability requirement.

....

(William) I'm against inventing a "Resource Access Pattern" when all we're saying is that people should use EPRs.

(IanR) We could refer to WS-Addressing directly and remove the indirection.

(William) I think that would be progress.

(MartinC) Yes.

(IanR) But the WS-Resource spec itself may still be needed, since it defines what a WS Resource is.

(DaveS) Yes, there are normative requirements separate from the "RAP" term.

(IanR) We could make RAP non-normative.

(MartinC) I don't think we need the term.

(William) It's not clear to me that we still need the WS-Resource spec.

(IanR) We would have to put the definition of WS-Resource (and the requirement to use WS-Addressing) somewhere.

(IanR) I could redraft WS-Resource to make “RAP” non-normative and replace normative refs to it from other specs.

(DaveS) We need to make sure this addresses the public comment, which pushes on whether WS Addressing is needed.

(IanR) The comment asks whether “RAP” is required. There is a requirement to have an identifier in the message.

(MartinC) Without “RAP” there is no issue.

(IanR) My impression was that the definition of “RAP” was unclear, but the MUST is still required to say something about the need for identifier. Does clearing this up resolve the issue?

...

(TimB) It does. WS Resources must use WS-Addressing.

(DaveS) Ok, yes. So, if we clean up the text as Ian suggested, or remove the indirection, that will make the normative requirements clear. The Primer can also make clear what WS Addressing does.

...

(William) What more do we need to say other than we use WS Addressing? We can get rid of the WS Resource spec.

(IanR) There’s more to WS Resource than using RAP.

...

(William) The only thing I see is that the RPdoc must be defined use XML, and use messages defined by WS-RP.

(IanR) Right, and this is pulled together in a single spec.

(William) I propose that in WS-RP we say WS-Addressing is needed, and that XML is needed.

(MartinC) No. The issue is the indirection via RAP.

(William) I want to go further.

(IanR) In Summary, the proposal is to replace normative refs to “RAP” in the WS-Resource spec with references to WS-Addressing in all specifications and to confirm in the response to the comment that it is a normative requirement. Also to check whether the use of “RAP” is still needed.

(MartinC) Seconded.

(IanR) Any objections?

(SteveG) I object – I think removing the concept also loses context.

(IanR) We only have 5 mins left, let’s continue via email or at the next call.

(MartinC) We could debate more and vote. Does anyone want to debate more?

(SteveG) I think we disagree, there’s nothing more to say.

(IanR) I propose to produce a version of the spec and we can vote on it next week.

(MartinC) That’s a little irregular, but Ok.

**Action:** (IanR) Produce detailed proposal.

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

Closed 13:30 Eastern time

Next telecon is on August 22nd.

### ***Summary of actions***

(TomM) Post revised draft of RMD specification. Carried Fwd from July 25th.

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

(Bryan) Move issue 123 to Closed.

(Bryan) Move issue 138 Open.

(DaveS) Investigate the implications of the resolution of issue 137 to make MemberserviceEPR optional. Work on precise language with Tom.

(Bryan) Move issue 137 to resolved. Incorporate any implications for the spec from Dave/Tom.

(IanR) Produce detailed resolution text for issue 127.