

Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC Teleconference 31st October 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=7748

The meeting is quorate.

Confirm minute taker

Tim Banks is taking the minutes.

Approve of minutes of Teleconference on 17th October

See: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/14971>

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

Call For AOB

None.

Action Review

(Bryan) Move issue wsrif153 to closed. **Done**

(Bryan) Move issues 154 and 155 to open. **Done**

(TC members) to review the AppNotes and Primer documents when posted and be ready to discuss at the next telecon. **See below**

(Bryan) Move issue 154/i, ii and iii to resolved **Done**

(Bryan) Move issue 155 to resolved. **Done**

Review of Public comments - Chair

PR2 comments from Fujitsu

See: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrif/email/archives/200510/msg00030.html>

(Ian) About Item 1 (RP/1447): WS Topics is pre-TC status. There was a similarly worded comment in PR1, wasn't this resolved?

(DaveS) I think the version reference to Topics is one PR version behind the reference to Base Notification.

(IanR) Aren't we ok to use non-TC versions? We have done so before provided we are based on PR drafts.

(DaveS) It's curious that there are refs to PR drafts for Base Notification and Topics, but the comment is only about Topics: we need some clarification.

(IanR) I propose we should respond that the WS-Topics spec has PR status and that this is not an issue.

(DaveS) I think so. It's not a burning issue until we go forward to a standard, when we should have more stability.

(IanR) Ok – about item 2 (unexplained wsnt: prefix): What do SteveG and JemT think? We could remove the prefix, or add the prefix in the namespace table (section 1.3), but the latter might imply the spec is required.

(SteveG) The document doesn't say the prefixes are needed – they are just used in the document. We should check why we removed it – we don't want to undo something important.

(IanR) Ok. Item 3: (Normative references to WS-Topic). We can respond in the same way as for item 1.

(DaveS) Except that the URL in the reference is wrong.

(SteveG) I'll look into it.

(IanR) Item 4: The reference to Base Faults is an editorial problem.

(IanR) Items 5 ... 11 are effectively the same as item 1.

(IanR) Item 12 seems to be a misunderstanding – AppNotes was not part of the Public review this time. None of these items seems to be substantive.

Action: (Ian) Send a note to the editors to describe the required editorial changes.

PR Comments from Mark McKeown

See [http://www.oasis-](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200510/msg00032.html)

[open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200510/msg00032.html](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200510/msg00032.html)

(IanR) Line 117 of WS Resource - use of 'logical' in the definition of a resource.

(DaveS) It seems clear to me – it's not a physical thing.

(IanR) I will respond with clarification – no change is needed to the spec.

(DaveS) Yes, this is not normative language.

(IanR) Any objections?

None.

(IanR) Line 118: there is an unused reference to URI, but we don't relate the resource identification to the URI; it is implementation-dependent and not a URI. We could remove the ref to URI following the recent removal of text that used the reference, but we don't need to.

(DaveS) Right, it's a harmless reference.

(IanR) So we should simply respond by clarifying what the spec means: resource identifiers are not URIs. Any objections?

None.

(IanR) Line 122 (text and diagram inconsistent): The issue says the definition of WS Resource is unclear. ("A WS Resource is a Web Service through which a resource can be accessed.") Should we say that the WS Resource is the aggregation of the Web Service and the resource that's accessed through it?

(DaveS) This seems wrong.

(IanR) I propose that we updated line 122 to say "WS Resource is the composition of a resource and a Web Service providing access to the resource".

(DaveS) I second that.

(IanR) Ok. So that could be considered substantive. I don't consider it so, but if it is, we would need to go through another 15 day public review period. Does anyone think it is substantive?

(BryanM) This seems to be restating what the TC was thinking all along.

(TomR) Does this affect anything on the wire? I think not.

(DaveS) No. Nothing.

(IanR) So, this is an action for the editors, and we should make this into an issue.

(BryanM) Issue 156 is this list of comments from Mark.

Action: (BryanM) More to resolved.

(IanR) At line 140 – the semi-circle in the picture is the Web service interface. Do we need to clarify this, and in other diagrams?

(TimB) Why don't we remove the semi-circle? It's not adding anything to the diagram, which is about identification of the WS Resource and Web service.

(IanR) Any objections to this, and to considering it a non-substantive change?

No Objections.

(IanR) Lines 137-138 (inconsistency): this is cleared up by the clarification of the definition of WS Resource.

(IanR) Line 148 (Examples): We don't need to use non-normative examples – we could respond to the comment saying that

(TimB) This might be affected by the comment about the TAG recommendations.

(IanR) Ok – so, line 148: The Tag recommendation. See:

<http://lists.w3.org/Archives/Public/www-tag/2005Oct/0057.html>

(IanR) We should respond that WS-RF makes no normative constraints on the EPRs.

Users should do as they wish with WS-Addressing

(TimB) What about the examples?

(IanR) They are non-normative.

(DaveS) We could use URI-only examples and deflect some attention.

(SteveG) Or take the examples out...

(IanR) The examples were included as a result of PR1 comments.

(SteveG) Pragmatically, the best thing is to take out the reference parameters

(DaveS) We could change the example – that would make the people at Tag more comfortable with our spec. It makes no difference to the spec itself.

(IanR) So, how strongly do people feel?

(DaveS) We are not fussed. Down the road we may not use ref parms, but now we do.

(IanR) So the motion is to replace the examples, to use parameter extensions to the URI instead of reference parameters. Any objections?

None.

(DaveS) So this is a clarification. What about the substantive nature of the change – we are just changing examples.

(IanR) Right.

No objections.

PR2 comments from Ramya Nagarajan

See <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200510/msg00033.html>

(IanR) This is about the UPA constraint and a validation error in the ServiceGroup schema.

(BryanM) We could move the 'any' above the RPDdoc element, but will we ever need a content element that's in the SG namespace.

(SteveG) That should not happen. I agree with the fix – it should be 'other'

(IanR) Any objections?

None.

(IanR) Is this a substantive change?

(SteveG) The only people who will notice are those using SG namespace elements; it's a corner case.

(IanR) Any objections?

None.

(Bryan) It's interesting, because the SG schema might need to be revved to a new namespace, and references to it would need to be changed.

(IanR) We could change the schema without revving

(DaveS) Don't we need to change the schema name anyway?

(IanR) No. We can just replace the schema at its current location.

(TomR) Someone might have implemented using the PR2 version.

(DaveS) They are very unlikely to notice the change..

(Bryan) ...but it is becoming more restrictive, except that is broken now because of the UPA constraint.

(TomR) I'd rather bump the revision...

(IanR) But there is more work required to do that.

(SteveG) We could send WSDM and WSrf mailing lists a note warning of the change.

(IanR) That is a pragmatic solution. The proposal is to fix the schema without changing the namespace/URI, and send emails to warn of changes.

(TomR) We should hold this until we have finished public review?

(IanR) There are not many PR comments left.

PR2 comments From Masahiro Kurosawa

See <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200510/msg00034.html>

(BryanM) This is a follow-up to issue 154.

(TimB) This is about the use of the composite interface in the MemberInterfaces attribute vs the components.

(IanR) How do we know which portTypes are there without portType inheritance?

(TimB) By the operation being there.

(IanR) We have already said in issue 154 that the portType is what's important.

(TimB) It's possible to put the components or the composite, or all of them. Provided the service implements them.

(DaveS) We can put in the primer that the contentrule/content can include information from any other sources – eg the spec for Lifetimes. It's handy to put constituent interfaces in MemberInterfaces.

(FredC) So there's a kind of best practice to say that the Interfaces info is useful, but not necessary.

(IanR) What's the proposal?

(DaveS) The simple answer is 'yes' the assertion in the comment is correct: including component interface info is useful.

(TimB) I could add a note in a box to say that this, though currently the example uses only the composite.

(DaveS) I would prefer we had an example which used the components.

(IanR) Why would we put this in the primer and not in the spec?

(DaveS) The normative statement in SG says that the MemberInterfaces are the ones that must be implemented by the MemberService. We don't make any statement about what's useful additional info.

(BryanM) It's odd to use MemberInterfaces to require a set interfaces when only a single can be exposed.

(TimB) Yes: the composite interfaces defines its derivation; why would we expect this info to be in the MemberInterfaces attribute?

(BryanM) We seem to need a better explanation of MemberInterfaces.

(IanR) Which should be in the spec.

(TimB) We don't want to insist that MemberInterfaces must contain all component interfaces – that could be a long list.

(IanR) We don't want to say MUST, nor SHOULD. The attribute should be the aggregate portType.

(TimB) The derivation info is contained in the wsdl.

(DaveS) Is it?

(TimB) The wsa:action attribute contains the info. So the spec should say that the recommended way is to put the Aggregate info in the MemberInterfaces.

(FredC) In real life it's the messages that matter, so there may be some way to identify the Lifecycle portType in the composed portType via the operation.

(SteveG) The action URI must be in the WSDL – that does it.

(IanR) Actually, the action URI is in appnotes – it's non-normative.

(SteveG) But the WSDL attribute way is the only way to make it work, so it's clear how to identify the portTypes.

(IanR) Two approaches are to clarify in the spec that the MemberInterface attribute is intended to be the composed portType and say in Appnotes that listing components is possible OR to say in the Appnotes section on portType composition that this can also be exploited by ServiceGroups that get partial info about MemberInterfaces supported by a MemberService.

(TimB) I prefer Appnotes; there's nothing normative to be changed.

(IanR) Is there anyone who thinks changes are needed to the ServiceGroup Spec?

(BryanM) Don't we need to decide between one or the other?(DaveS) I might be interested only in some component of the services in the group. SG needs to be able to do this.

(BryanM) What does the spec say now?

(DaveS) Members must support the portType.

(BryanM) Interesting: there is only one interface – it's made of copy/pasted operations.

(IanR) Could we get a proposal for appnotes changes?

Action: (Tim/Dave) Propose text via distribution list for inclusion

(BryanM) Should we reopen issue 154?

(IanR) Yes.

Action: Move issue 154 to open?

(IanR) We can go back around to the schema: I propose we make the change without changing namespace and alert potential implementers via mailing lists. Any objections.
None

Action: (BryanM) Move issue 157 to resolved

Comments on Application Notes document of Oct 20 - Create a review team if required.

(IanR) We should have a team to do this – spec editors should do this – is that possible?

No objections.

(IanR) Would anyone else like to join?

None.

Action: Spec Editors – review AppNotes and send comments to the list by Nov 14

Comments on Primer document updated on Oct 21

(IanR) Are there people who would be willing to review the primer?

(JemT) I have started.

(IanR) I will do this too

Action: Jem and Ian to review

Comments on ResourceMetadataDescriptor document updated on Oct 30.

(IanR) Dave has volunteered to review this. Can Bryan do it too?

(Bryan) Ok.

Action: Dave and Bryan review by next TC.

AOB

(IanR) Is the next telecon date Ok?

(SteveG) Thanksgiving is 24th, but will not affect us.

(IanR) Next meetings are on 13th and 27th.

[Correction – should be Monday 14th and 28th Nov

See <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/calendar.php>]

Straggler Roll Call

Closed 13:30

Summary of actions

(Ian) Send a note to the editors to describe changes required in answer to Fujitsu comments.

(BryanM) More issue 156 (McKeown comments) to resolved.

(BryanM) Reopen issue 154

(Tim/Dave) Propose text for resolution of issue 154 via distribution list.

(BryanM) Move issue 157 to resolved

(Spec Editors) Review AppNotes and send comments to the list by Nov 14

(Jem/Ian) Review Primer and send comments to the list by Nov 14

(Bryan/DaveS) Review updated RMD by Nov 14