

Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC Teleconference 14th November 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=7749

The meeting is quorate.

Confirm minute taker

Tim Banks is taking the minutes.

Approve of minutes of Teleconference on 31st October

See: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15171>

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

Call For AOB

None.

Action Review

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

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

(BryanM) Reopen issue 154 **Done**

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

(BryanM) Move issue 157 to resolved **Done**

(Spec Editors) Review AppNotes and send comments to the list by Nov 14
Comments from Tim and Dan, Reviewed by Ian wrt WS Resource (with no issues). **Carry Fwd.**

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

(Bryan/DaveS) Review updated RMD by Nov 14 **Carry Fwd**

Review of Public comments - Chair

(DaveS) Two new comments were received concerning BaseFaults and answered by Ian:

See http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/wsrif-comment/200511/msg?list_name=wsrf-comment&monthdir=200511&msg=msg00000.html

And http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/wsrif-comment/200511/msg?list_name=wsrf-comment&monthdir=200511&msg=msg00001.html

(IanR) One was a suggestion which contradicted previous TC decisions, the other was about a particular tool.

New Issues. (Bryan)

Issue 156 & Definition of WS Resource wrt Primer.

(DaveS) Issue 156 is resolved, but Kirk made some follow-up comments.

See: [http://www.oasis-](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200511/msg00002.html)

[open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200511/msg00002.html](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200511/msg00002.html)

and [http://www.oasis-](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200511/msg00007.html)

[open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200511/msg00007.html](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200511/msg00007.html)

(Kirk) This is about the definition of 'resource' is it only logical, or physical too. Tim has explained that there is not an inconsistency, but the statement in the Primer needs expansion to round out the definition/terminology wrt WS Resource.

(DaveS) So can we continue without reopening issue 156, but updating the Primer. Any objections?

None.

Action: (TimB) Make updates to Primer.

(BryanM) Issue 158 and 159 are new numbers since last time

Issue WSRF158: Fujitsu Public Review Comments on WS-ResourceProperties

(IanR) This was discussed at the last week . It needs to move to resolved.

Action: (Bryan) Move issue 158 to resolved.

Issue WSRF159: Fujitsu Public Review Comments on WS-ResourceLifetime

(IanR) This was discussed at the last week . It needs to move to resolved, the same applies to issues 160 and 161 on BaseFaults and ServiceGroup

Action: (Bryan) Move issue 159, 160, 161 to resolved.

Issue WSRF162: Primer comments

(Kirk) These are stylistic comments on the introductory chapters.

(TimB) These are resolved by making the updates as suggested in the proposal.

Action: (BryanM) Move to resolved

Issue WSRF163: Extensibility needed in metadata

See: [http://www.oasis-](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200511/msg00008.html)

[open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200511/msg00008.html](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200511/msg00008.html)

(DaveS) Are there any objections to opening this?

None.

Action:(Bryan) More to Open.

(DaveS) So, we're left with 118 (cut/Copy/Paste for metadata) 154

(MembershipContentRule) and 163 (RMD extensibility) that are open.

Steps to Committee spec - chair (Pending from last call)

(DaveS) We have no news about progress on WS Topics.

(IanR) We need the editors to complete on editorial changes and upload then we can consider them for committee drafts.

(DaveS) We still need to get a PR draft of Topics from the WSN group, to replace the working Draft which we currently refer to, then we can go forward to committee spec which is organised by OASIS.

OASIS Symposium 9-12 May: The Meaning of Interoperability

(DaveS) This is for the attention of the the TC. We need to anticipate participation in this meeting, and we might think about doing a Face to face (mtg is in San Francisco), or doing a paper on interoperability.

WSDM Comments on RMD – Heather Kreger (Issue 163)

(DaveS) Additional requirements for metadata, have been suggested by the WSDM TC, such as Notification of relationships.

(Heather) We need an extension point so that RMD is a metadata document for the WS Resource rather than only metadata about properties. WSDM can define its own metadata for various reasons (info about operations, about capabilities, about relationships) and we want those to be in one metadata document rather than create new documents for them. We might want to put information about Topics that are published.

(DaveS) Topics would already be properties, so the properties element would already be sufficient.

(Heather) These things aren't really defined yet – apart from the metadata about operations - but we are asking that WSRF consider that there are additional requirements.

(IanR) What is the concrete requirement?

(Heather) We need the Any element added back to the top-level in the RMD document.

(DaveS) So you want 0..* of Any?

(Heather) Yes. The three points behind this facility are (See <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrp/email/archives/200511/msg00008.html>)

[Metadata about Relationships, notifications, operations, associated policies or agreements.]

(DaveS) Let's consider operations. What's needed here?

(Heather) WSDM wants to record which management capability (WSDM 1.1) an operation is associated with, and what preconditions are needed for it, and the postconditions. Those things are defined, and in the future we also need to know about idempodency: can we safely re-invoke operations.

(DaveS) These things would be static wrt the portType definition – effectively it's an annotation of the WSDL. (Rather than on the properties).

(Heather) We can't have it in the WSDL, because this kind of information can be independent of the operation signature.

(DaveS) The idea of the metadata is that it is a descriptor about the properties which is required before the operation is invoked. Is the new requirement of this same nature? Does it affect the way one makes tools rather than the way one discovers?

(Heather) Yes. It's about how a manager uses it.

(DaveS) All of this could be wrapped up in properties, for example a property describing the idempodency of operations.

(Heather) It's important to separate data from resources from metadata about resources. Otherwise it gets too complicated.

(DaveS) The distinction is that the metadata is static. If the data is dynamic, then it can be expressed as properties.

(IanR) That is the point of the RMD spec – to keep them separate.

(DaveS) But sometimes it doesn't always happen – dynamic metadata gets mixed in with properties.

(Heather) An example might be timescales on metrics, which we represent as attributes [on messages] they come back on every message.

(DaveS) Any more questions

(IanR) Are we discussing opening the issue? Or do we have a proposal?

(DaveS) We have an open issue, so we are discussing the issue.

(IanR) So the proposal is to put back the Any?

(DaveS) Yes, as a child of the top-level element.

(SteveG) Will we violate the UPA constraint?

(DaveS) It should be Any with namespace other.

(Fred) I think there is only one element, and we are adding another after it.

(Bryan) The property element is optional, so we can't follow it with Any.

(DaveS) There is a documentation element also.

(Bryan) We need to put Any with namespace=other, or put Any at the beginning.

(DaveS) Right, we know how, but should we do it.

(IanR) Why wouldn't we?

(TomR) Is this a substantive change?

(DaveS) This document isn't in public review.

(IanR) Seems to me we don't aggressively put extensibility in until we have an identified a use case, but now we have one.

(DaveS) Ok. We can extend things explicitly if we want to, based on experience with the Any.

(TimB) Are there any limits on the use of the Any? Can it be abused? Are there things that should go in other documents and not in RMD?

(DaveS) If one had a mechanism to get the metadata, we need to define how a client responds to things that it can't understand. Does the client need to understand, (which affects interoperability) or can it ignore what it doesn't understand (which constrains the Any). We need to say that ignorance is acceptable.

(Fred) This amounts to saying what RMD is good for. Surely we already have that statement. We might need more text about the use of the Any.

(?) We should be ok saying that clients may ignore what is not understood.

(Heather) WSDM Would be OK with that.

(Fred) That is the definition of an optional Any.

(TimB) Ok

(DaveS) Any more comments? The motion is to add Add an Any, namespace=other with description to say that the client may ignore any information in the Any.

Any objections?

None.

Action: (BryanM) Move to resolved.

Issue WSRF118: How do you cut/copy/paste portions of metadata...

(IanR) This is about removing text from RMD into the AppNotes. It is out of the spec, but not into the AppNotes.

(DaveS) Is there anything new about this or is it the same as the portType cut/copy/paste

(Dan) It's the same kind of thing

(DaveS) So we should take it out of the spec, but we can't put it into the current Appnotes because that might hold up the rest of the AppNotes

(IanR) Revising the apnotes is easy at a later stage.

(DaveS) So we should put this in a 'holding tank' and put it into AppNotes when we produce the RMD spec itself.

(Dan) The text is in section 7 para 2 of version wd-4 of RMD.

(DaveS) This text can be cut out and included in the Issues doc for later movement.

(BryanM) The whole, or just the last part.

(DaveS) Let's copy the whole paragraph, and rework the paragraph in RMD.

Any Objections?

(DaveS) We also need to change the contact from Tom Maguire to Dan.

Action Move to Resolved.

Issue WSRF154: PR Comment – Use of MemberContentRule

(TimB) The proposal is here: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200511/msg00006.html>.

(DaveS) This doesn't require any changes in the schema.

(TimB) No - it exploits a natural non-normative extension of the SG semantics.

(DaveS) Existing Globus implementations use a different method: they document the components in the MembershipContentRule. I'm not happy with this. An alternative is to clarify the SG spec, but it would be non-normative.

(TimB) Where in the spec is clarification?

(DaveS) It's line 282 in the spec – MemberInterfaces is a list of QName.

(IanR) Line 299 doesn't allow anything information about the derivation of the portType.

(DaveS) Right, so it would have to be done using the email proposal, but the proposal lacks directness: another way is to require a property in every WS Resource that lists the components and put named elements in the Content. This could be done via a profile extension to WSRF . Meantime, the emailed proposal is encouraging another approach. I like the spec the way it is, so don't want to change that.

(TimB) Do we need to provide an answer in AppNotes. We could simply respond with the idea in the response to the Public Comment.

(IanR) I think we need to back it up with something in our documents.

(DaveS) I would really like a better way, but that's impossible with our current specs.

(IanR) So should we have an imperfect solution or nothing at all? How imperfect is it?

(DaveS) It will be unfortunate if we encourage a sub-optimal way to do it: we may end up with two ways to do it

(IanR) Nothing in AppNotes is normative. I second the motion to accept Tim's proposal.

(DaveS) Is there anyone besides me who objects to the proposal as documented being included in AppNotes?

None.

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved

(DaveS) So AppNotes, Primer and RMD review is outstanding for next time. But now we have no unresolved issues.

Straggler Roll Call

Closed 13:33

Summary of actions

(Spec Editors) Review AppNotes and send comments to the list. Carried fwd from 31st Oct.

(Jem/Ian) Review Primer and send comments to the list. Carried fwd from 31st Oct.

(Bryan/DaveS) Review updated RMD. Carried fwd from 31st Oct.

(TimB) Make updates to Primer regarding definitions of resource/WS Resource

(Bryan) Move issues 158, 159, 160, 161 to resolved

(BryanM) Move issue 162 to resolved

(Bryan) Move issue 163 to Resolved

(Bryan) Move issue 118 to Resolved

(Bryan) Move issue 154 to resolved