

Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC Teleconference 28th 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=7750

The meeting is quorate.

Confirm minute taker

Tim Banks is taking the minutes.

Approve of minutes of Teleconference on 14th October

See: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/15599>

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

Call For AOB

None.

Action Review

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

(IanR) Have we had sufficient review?

(Roger) Comments have been comprehensive. There are things to discuss, but review is sufficient

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

(IanR) Have we had sufficient review?

(Tim) Yes.

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

(Bryan) I notified the WSDM group, and some feedback has come back. I have not concluded the review

(DaveS) Nor me.

(IanR) Have we had sufficient review?

(Dan) I think RMD is complex, so we shouldn't assume 'no comments means' it's good.

(IanR) The next thing to do is to go forward for public review, so we should get all comments from the WSDM first, but a PR would focus attention.

(BryanM) WSDM did bring forward the issue we discussed last time. They are considering another one, but there is nothing beyond that.

(IanR) When was RMD last updated?

(Dan) October 31st.

(IanR) So when can the next working draft be? Can it be in time for the next telecon?

(Dan) Yes

(IanR) So lets do that and notify WSDM when there is new draft, give them a week for further comments, and then we can vote to adopt it as a committee draft then go for public review.

Action: Carry Fwd

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

(TimB) Discussion with Kirk is not closed. The definitions of resource are updated. WS Resource has been discussed.

(IanR) We should close this issue and open a new one if there are comments on the current words.

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

(BryanM) Move issue 162 to resolved. **Done**

(Bryan) Move issue 163 to Resolved. **Done**

(Bryan) Move issue 118 to Resolved. **Done**

(Bryan) Move issue 154 to resolved. **Done**

Potential new issues to consider – Bryan

Issue WSRF164: PR Comment: InitialTerminationTime element of Add operation should be nillable

See: [http://www.oasis-](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200511/msg00031.html)

[open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200511/msg00031.html](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200511/msg00031.html)

(IanR) The words in the spec disagree with the schema regarding nillability of the TerminationTime in the Add Request, so the raiser of the issue is correct and a fix to the schema is required.

(TimB) We should also consider the response to Add – which is has a mandatory TerminationTime that is nillable. Does the lack of TerminationTime in the request mean something different from a nilled one? If so, why do the Add request and response differ?

(BryanM) The lack of TerminationTime in the request means it's up to the service to set the value.

(DaveS) There is a case for optionality on the request because the client may not be bothered with it. But other clients might need to know in the response whether there is a termination time.

(TimB) It is possible to have a serviceGroup entry with no Scheduled Destruction behaviour.

(IanR) The meaning of xsi:nil in the response is that there is no termination time. If there is no termination time property then there is no scheduled destruction behaviour and no termination time, and the 'nil' in the response is correctly describing that.

(DaveS) I propose the only change we make is that we fix the xsd to make the terminationTime request nillable.

(BryanM) Seconded.

Action: Move to resolved.

(IanR) Is this a substantive change? We have already made a non-substantive change, but does this change the decision? I don't think so

DaveS) Me neither.

(IanR) Does anyone disagree?

No-One.

Issue resolution

No Issues outstanding.

Primer review feedback - Tim

(TimB) The primer has been available for review since October 21st. Jem and Ian made comments and these have been incorporated in working draft 9. Further corrections have been made and version wd-10 is now the latest.

There is an outstanding question about issue wsrp 20. The AppNotes has no example for the CommonBaseEvents notification format. The Primer example is simpler, but is it right?

(Roger) Yes, can someone give me some help with this?

(IanR) The primer example should be, and currently is, simple.

(BryanM) AppNotes needs to get across that some messages may have the property change as a direct child, but that it could also be enclosed in descendent layers.

(TimB) This makes life difficult for a receiver of the message.

(Dan) How does the receiver know whether this is a

(DaveS) The requirements are strong and client needs to be able to absorb it. We need two or three use cases in the AppNotes, and a simple example in the primer. I would leave the spec the way it is.

(Roger) So there's a notify element, then a CBE element, and then the client needs to dig out the PropertyChange element.

(BryanM) The WSDM primer has an example with a WSDM event format.

(IanR) So far, no-one has said they need changes to the primer. I propose we adopt the primer wd-10 as a committee draft. We need a full majority vote and we can do this now via phone. The following voted 'yes' Mario Antonioletti, Tom Rutt, David Snelling, Bryan Murray, Latha Srinivasan, Jem Treadwell, Mitsunori Satomi, Tim Banks, Stephen Graham, Ian Robinson, Martin Chapman, Alain Regnier, Lily Liu, John Fuller. 14 Votes for approval, no abstentions or No votes.

Action: Move to Committee draft on the Web site.

(IanR) Should we put this forward for public review or just leave it as committee draft?

(Bryan) Committee draft is enough.

(TomR) It can have the same visibility to the outside world. It sounds good to me.

(DaveS) We might get comments from public review, but it's not unnecessary for a non-normative document.

(IanR) Ok, we can change our minds in the future, but for now we are resolved not to take it to public review.

AppNotes review feedback - Roger

(Roger) There are two things to resolve, but good feedback has come from three people. Here are following issues:

- We need some examples
- Should the order of resource properties be preserved when cutting and pasting.
(DaveS) This is a style thing, not a mandatory requirement.
(Roger) The document has a SHOULD, but capitalisation should be removed from the AppNotes.
- Section 3.6.1 about the common base events is unfinished.

So, still not finished, but getting close.

(Jem) It needed the comments to be addressed before we could read through without distraction. The latest version still has markup – can we have a clean copy and I will review it.

(Roger) Ok.

(IanR) If all comments are accepted and a clean version uploaded, I will initiate a 7 day ballot. This will be a voting and commenting opportunity. We have already had a public review, and we can decide whether to have another 15 day period.

Action: (Roger/Ian) Refresh and review vote for new committee draft.

Schedule for committee specs – chair

(IanR) Right now our specs reference three WS-N specs. Unfortunately, the URLs don't resolve because the public review has not started. We should vote on producing committee specs when the WS-N public review starts. The WS-N ballot should start this week.

(DaveS) I think we should start the ballot without waiting for a telecon, once the URLs resolve.

(IanR) Alternatively we should fall-back to the old specs.

(DaveS) Let's wait until the next call to decide this.

AOB

There will be no telecon on 26th Dec.

Straggler Roll Call

Closed 13:01

Next telecon is 12th December

Summary of actions

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

(Bryan) Move issue 164 to resolved.

(Tim/Ian) Move Primer wd-10 to a Committee draft on the Web site.

(Roger/Ian) Refresh AppNotes and setup ballot to allow review/vote for new committee draft.