

Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC Teleconference 3rd April 2006

Agenda

See: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrif/event.php?event_id=7759

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=7759

The meeting was quorate.

Confirm minute taker

Tim Banks is taking the minutes.

Approve minutes of Teleconference on 20th March

See: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/17334>

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

Call for AOB

None

Action Review - chair

(Chairs) Agenda item to decide on Public Comment for AppNotes. Carried from 6th March. **Done**

(Bryan) move issue 165 to resolved as per the proposals in the issue list. **Done**

(DaveS) Write up the issue to consider byValue resourceProperty for the MDD and send to the list. **Done** (Now issue 174)

(Bryan) Move issue 173 to resolved. **Done**

(Bryan) Move issue 166 to resolved as proposed. **Done**

(Bryan) Move issue 167 to resolved as amended. **Done**

(Bryan) Move issue 168 to resolved. **Done**

OASIS members ballot results - chair

The required 15% of the OASIS members was surpassed - 21% of members (72 votes) voted yes, no-one against, and the specs are now an OASIS standard!

[Big Round of Applause]

Action (IanR) Send out editors instructions to rename the documents from 'cd' to 'os'.

AppNotes - Roger

Ballot to approve CD-02 closed on 25 March and approved the document.

(Roger) I made three changes since the approved version – these are to make references be active links, to avoid referencing the WSDL binding of WS Addressing, and to change 'cardinality' to 'multiplicity' in section 3.1.1.4.

(Ian) Since changes were made since the approval ballot, we need to agree that they are only editorial corrections and we should approve the new version as the committee draft. Are there any objections to this?

[None]

Action (Roger) Post pdf version of the updated draft to be placed in the TC space as a permanent link.

(IanR) We need to decide whether we need more public review. Does anyone want to propose that we have a new public review?

[No-one]

(DaveS) We have one round of review, yes?

(IanR) Yes, but didn't get many comments, and the document has since changed.

However, I don't think we'll get much out of a new review – the TC has reviewed it and we are not intending to advance it to an OASIS standard. If we make more changes as a result of RMD (for example) we can reconsider.

(IanR) Are there any objections to leaving the current draft as a committee draft?

[None]

Primer - Tim

Tim has posted an updated Primer with the resolution to issue 166 (resolvable hyperlinks to examples).

(TimB) I also changed references to anticipate the new names or the standards. We need to review it and vote on it to be adopted

(IanR) So we can set up a ballot in a week's time to run for one week.

(DaveS) We also need to appoint reviewers – who would like to take a look?

(IanR) I will.

(Jem) I will.

Action (Ian & Jem) Review new draft of the Primer.

Action (IanR) After review, set up ballot to adopt the new draft of the primer.

Issue resolution - Chair

WSRF169: Typos in RMD

(IanR) Are there any objections to resolving the issue as proposed? These are all editorial corrections.

[None].

Action (Bryan) Move to resolved.

Issue WSRF172: Remove attribute extensibility for ValidValue, ValidValueRange, and StaticValue

(IanR) Was extensibility put there for a specific reason, or as a catch-all.

(TimB) We put extensibility on attributes to allow GoodUntil etc to be incorporated.

(DaveS) Yes, those are employed on the ResourceProperty attributes. It might be confusing to put it on metadata – does it apply the metadata or the RP?

(IanR) Does it causes harm.

(BrannM) I think it gives us flexibility in the future, for example to say that some values are valid are when the moon is full.

(DaveS) Yes. I don't see a problem with keeping it.

(IanR) I think this is a motion to close with No action. Any objections?

[None]

Action (Bryan) Move issue 172 to close with no action.

Issue WSRF174: Metadata Descriptor Instance as Resource Property

(IanR) This is about having a MDD as an RP. Don't we already have this?

(DaveS) No- this is about a by-value instead/in addition to a by-reference.

(IanR) Why would one need this?

(DaveS) This is about being able to get the MDD using known mechanism in wsrf. With a reference (URI) the get may or may not work. The uri is maybe different from the one in the wsdl (the metadata is instance-specific) and what protocol should be used to get it?

(IanR) So if there was a deterministic way of consuming the reference, then this would not be an issue.

(DaveS) Right, but we don't have such a way, except via http, which loses the Web services security and other good stuff.

(Dan) One option is to introduce a getmetadata for wsrf.

(DaveS) But we already have a way of getting information from a WS Resource. What's the problem using it?

(BryanM) This could make the RP doc very large.

(DaveS) In most cases it would be small.

(Bryan) Not if one has metadata for every RP, it would be larger than the RP document.

(DaveS) The Dynamic MDD only needs to describe dynamic MDD – it can be optional.

(Dan) So a separate operation might be useful for other types of metadata, such as wsdl.

(IanR) This is out of scope – we only need to tackle the RMD.

(DaveS) Anyway, wsdl could be available as an RP, too.

(BryanM) Sometimes the metadata could go in the EPR – at least a reference could go there.

(DaveS) That works for static metadata. My scenarios for dynamic metadata haven't been strongly supported by the Grid community, so uniform access is the main reason to do it.

(IanR) We are really concerned with static the metadata

(DaveS) There are three kinds: static (baked with the wsdl), instance-static -(that's different from instance to instance) and truly dynamic. The latter is tackled by the Grid people via dynamic attributes on the ResourceProperties themselves.

(IanR) What if the URI were an EPR to a new WS Resource? The GetRP would then work on the MDD document via the separate WS Resource.

(DaveS) Ok. I think this would be good.

(IanR) It would be as dynamic as you like.

(DaveS) And it separates the metadata from the resource which is a clean model: one could have metadata about metadata.

(Dan) How does one get the MDD?

(DaveS) With getResourceProperty.

(IanR) And update is allowed, too.

(DaveS) Is anyone unhappy with the loss of the URI if we replaced it with the EPR?

[No-One]

(IanR) Do we need any more discussion here?

(DaveS) let's recap: we need to replace the MDDref URI with the MDDEPR and state that the EPR points to a WS Resource whose RP Doc is the MDD. This means that the resource supports GetRP, and we can guarantee to get it.

(IanR) I think it would be wise to write the text and review it next time. I am happy to write it.

Action (IanR) Write resolution text for issue 174.

(DaveS) We need to note that we must edit both schema and document, since I think the two are inconsistent at the moment.

(Dan) I have another potential issue for RMD. There was once an InitialValues which was useful, but this seems to have been lost. I propose a new issue to add InitialValues back in.

(DaveS) Wasn't there an old issue on it?

(IanR) Dave's recent review issue mentions 'InitialValues'

(Dan) Right, but where is it now?

(IanR) Lets have a new issue proposal on the list and deal with it next time.

Action (Dan) Email Issue proposal for InitialValues.

The next 2 scheduled telecons

(Ianr) The next telecons coincide with national holidays in some countries (Apr 17 and May 1). We need to consider whether we should cancel both of these and ask WS-N TC if we could share the slot on Apr 24.

(DaveS) We are in TC run-down mode, can we do the two outstanding issues by email and resolve by ballot and take two calls off.

(IanR) That would mean the next call is May 15th.

(DaveS) I think we could survive, and we would be in shape to discuss going for a committee draft on 15th.

(IanR) Does anyone object to Dave's proposal?

(Dan) No, it's fine with me.

[No-one else]

(IanR) Let's say we need proposed resolutions for two issues in 7 days, and then I'll set up a ballot to approve them. Then Dan can make a new working draft ready for a ballot or telecon.

(TimB) We need to open the issue about InitialValues.

(IanR) Are there any objections to opening the InitialValue issue?

[None]

Action (BryanM) Open new issue about InitialValues based on email from Dan.

AOB

None.

Straggler Roll Call – see Meeting record.

Closed 18:00.

Next telecon is in six weeks on 15th May.

Summary of actions

(IanR) Send out editors instructions to rename the documents from 'cd' to 'os'.

(Roger) Post pdf version of the updated AppNotes draft for placement as a permanent link.

(Ian & Jem) Review new version of the Primer.

(IanR) After review, set up ballot to adopt the new draft of the primer.

(Bryan) Move issue 172 to closed. No action.

(IanR) Write resolution text for issue 174.

(Dan) Email issue proposal for InitialValues.

(BryanM) Open new issue about InitialValues based on email from Dan.