Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC Teleconference
9th January 2006

Agenda
See: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/event.php?event_id=7753

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/wsrf/event.php?event_id=7753

The meeting is quorate.

Confirm minute taker
Tim Banks is taking the minutes.

Approve of minutes of Teleconference on 12th December
See: http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/16126
There were no comments and no objections to approving the minutes.

Call For AOB
None.

Action Review
(Chairs) Set up a ballot for approval of new AppNotes. See agenda item below.
(Tim/Dave) Execute on/Review issue 164 resolution. **Done**
(BryanM) Move issues 156, 158 and 159 to closed. **Done**
(Tim) Execute updates for issue 157. **Done**
(IanR) Verify the changes for issues 157 and 164. **Done**
(Chairs) After completion of 157 and 164 - Organise ballot for committee specs. **Done**
(IanR) After the ballot, check that the multi-line PDFs are Ok. (Issues 161 & 160). Pending production of pdfs. Carry Fwd.
(DaveS) Cancel the face-to-face via an explicit note to the mailing list. **Done**

Potential new issues to consider - Bryan
No new issues

Issue resolution – Chair
No open issues.

(IanR) I have checked the execution of issue 162 in the Primer – this can be closed.
Action (Bryan) Move 162 to closed

Production of committee spec PDFs - Ian

(IanR) The Ballot ends today, and there is currently the required majority.
The CS PDFs need to be produced by the spec editors.
(Required before we can close issues 160, 161.)
Action: (Ian) Send mail with instructions for production of CS pdfs.
This is a great milestone. Let's congratulate ourselves!

Progression to OASIS standard - Ian

Are we ready to go on to create OASIS standards? I think they are and propose we go on
to have a ballot to decide whether to submit the current specs as OASIS standards.
(BryanM) WS Addressing is still not a w3c recommendation. It may change.
(IanR) The WS-A group have said they will not be changing their namespace.
(TomR) That is the goal, and to-date there have been no changes, and none are expected,
but the process of testing interop isn't finished.
(IanR) My understanding is that the thing most likely to change is the wsdl binding.
Although there is some risk involved in going ahead now, the risk is low, so we should
go ahead now. We are in better shape than some other OASIS standards wrt WS
Addressing.
(TomR) I can live with this, though I haven't talked to Fujitsu about a company position.
(DaveS) The namespace is committed, it won't be withdrawn.
(TomR) That's right.
(IanR) The IBM reps don't expect things to change.
(TomR) Right- there are no open issues
(IanR) There will have to be a vote, but is there any objection to setting up the ballot?
(BryanM) No, but we should learn from what happened to WSDM.
(TomR) I spoke to a w3c team member and it will take until May or June to get things to
full standard.
(DaveS) I don't want to wait that long.
(BryanM) So are we willing to go to a 1.1 level if WS-A Changes something?
(IanR) Yes, but the risk of that is low and outweighs the irritation of waiting 6 months for
nothing to change.
(BryanM) Well, we gambled on WSDM and lost.
(DaveS) We knew there was a risk for WSDM.
(IanR) The situation is much better now; WS-A had not got a stable namespaces and
there was a dependency on an incomplete WSRF.
(~~Kirk~~Fred) I don't remember any of the WSDM feedback being about textual or
namespace changes: it was about depending on things that are not standards.
(BryanM) We are doing the same thing here.
(IanR) Nevertheless, WSDM has standardized, and WS-A has progressed.
(TomR) WS-A is at 'Candidate Recommendation' waiting for interop tests.
(DaveS) I think we are in good shape to convince others in Fujitsu. Going forward to a
ballot is a motivation to do that.
(IanR) Is there any other discussion needed?
(BryanM) I don't think it's a good idea, but we've had all the discussion needed.
(IanR) If there are no objections, I will ask OASIS staff to go ahead.
(TomR) How long is the ballot?

(IanR) It's a TC ballot and takes 7 days. We won't close it by 15th Jan, so the OASIS Admin will not distribute to the OASIS member ship for consideration until ~~we might get to OASIS standard by~~ the end of Feb.

(DaveS) We probably have 2 ~~weeks~~ week before the internal TC vote as a preparation for the company vote.

Action: (Chairs) Organise the ballot for progression to Committee spec

(IanR) Martin Chapman raised the point that we should have separate votes for each spec, but I think the specs go as a bundle, and I wouldn't want to split them now. If one did not go forward, we should stop all of them in case the successful ones were affected by changes in the one that was stopped. Also, it will be more complex to have 5 ballots. However, since Martin asked, so what do others think?

(TomR) I think the real issue is whether the specs stand alone or are a bundle. We would have to discuss separation if there was the proposal for separation.

(DaveS) It's easier to go ahead technically if they go together. Nobody had a problem with the technical bundling last time. We should have a single vote.

(IanR) Does anyone want to speak in favour of having 5 votes?

No-one.

(IanR) So I think that we have had a reasonable discussion, and the TC has decided to have a single vote.

AppNotes

(IanR) The following "resolved" issues have been addressed in the latest version of AppNotes (http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/download.php/16005/wsrf-application_notes-1.2-notes-wd-05-jem.doc) and so can be closed:

WSRF20: Notification message format not clear

WSRF103: Multiple Service Port elements legitimate?

WSRF151: AppNotes comments from Ricoh

(Roger) That's right.

Action: (BryanM) Close, 20, 103 and 151.

The following SG issue needs to be addressed per the agreed resolution:

WSRF154: PR Comment – Use of MemberContentRule

(IanR) We should address this before we have a ballot for Committee Draft, and there are outstanding comments.

(Roger) Yes, that's reasonable. We have answers for many of the comments.

(IanR) If we put RMD issues to one side, what is a good timeframe for cleaning it up?

(Roger) Ok, probably two weeks. Also I need some exchange with the ServiceGroup editors.

(IanR) Wrt 154, there is some text in the issues doc that should be directly pasteable.

(Roger) Ok, yes.

When the issues have been resolved and 154 can be closed, we can have a ballot for Committee Draft. Do we need to take it any further? We stopped at CD for the Primer and, like the Primer, this is non-normative.

(DaveS) I don't have strong feelings, but the thing that's different about AppNotes is that it provides implementation details that refine what's said in the specs. So, the AppNotes do help with interop.

(TomR) Could we expect more out of the public review than we have had from internal review? This would weed out more inconsistencies. Going for a full OASIS standard for a non-normative doc is another question.

(IanR) Perhaps a reasonable approach is to go for public review.

(DaveS) This would encourage WSDM to take a look.

(IanR) So the proposal is to go to PR for Appnotes. Are you sending, Tom?

(TomR) Yes

(IanR) Any objections?

None.

Action (Roger) Execute on remaining updates.

ResourceMetadataDescriptor

(IanR) Which of the following issues have been addressed in the latest RMD draft (and so can be closed)?

WSRF119: What should we name the metadata container, and does it need extensibility?

WSRF120: Describe rules for overlapping descriptors in metadata

WSRF163: WSDM Comment: Extensibility needed in metadata

WSRF155: Incorrect Property definitions in RMD

(Dan) I think all of these are addressed, except that for 120, which relates to 118. The movement of text for resolution of issue 118 is still to be done. The text is still in RMD, but the text which needs moving is identified.

(IanR) Is it reasonable for Dan/Roger to move the text and in the next two weeks?

(DaveS) Is this the only RMD issue against AppNotes.

(Roger) Right.

(IanR) So AppNotes may need some introductory comments about RMD.

(IanR) Is two weeks sufficient? After that we would need to give the TC time to review the final versions.

(Roger) Ok.

Action (Dan) Execute on remaining updates

Straggler Roll Call – see Meeting record.

Closed 17:45

Next telecon is 23ʳᵈ Jan.

Summary of actions

(IanR) Check that the multi-line PDFs are Ok. (Issues 161 & 160). Pending production of pdfs. Carry Fwd.

(Bryan) Move 162 to closed.

(Ian) Send mail with instructions for production of CS pdfs.

(Chairs) Organise the ballot for progression to Committee spec.

(BryanM) Close, 20, 103 and 151.
(Roger) Execute on remaining updates to AppNotes, including transfer of text from RMD for issue 118.
(Dan) Execute on remaining updates to RMD.