Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC
Teleconference
15th May 2006

Agenda

See: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/event.php?event_id=11816

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=11816
The meeting was quorate.

Confirm minute taker

Tim Banks is taking the minutes.

Approve minutes of Teleconference on 3rd April

See: http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/17519
There were no comments on the minutes and no objections to approving them.

Call for AOB

None.

Action Review - chair

(Ian & Jem) Review new version of the Primer. **Done**
(IanR) After review, set up ballot to adopt the new draft of the primer. **Done**
(Bryan) Move issue 172 to closed. No action. **Done**
(IanR) Set up e-ballots for remaining RMD issues given 6-week gap between April 3 and May 18. Resolved one, one still in progress, plus raised a new one. See below.

Review of ballot progress (Ian)

(IanR) We've had two ballots. Issue 175 (Initial Values) was resolved. The second ballot was to approve the updated Primer as a new committee draft, following review by Ian/Jem, and this ballot is still in progress and runs until next Saturday. If this ballot succeeds, this would finish off the Primer. The essential difference with this Primer is that it has updated links to the OS standards, and hyperlinks to the full xml for the examples.

New Issues

WSRF176: Simplification of metadataDescriptorLocation type

See: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200604/msg00050.html

(IanR) This was spun off from issue 174, and proposes simplifying the schema for the RMD spec. Currently we have pairs of URIs for metadataDescriptorLocation for the metadatadescriptor when, in fact, we need only one URI. The multiples hark back to the time when we had multiple metaDatadescriptor docs and composition thereof, but now we only have one doc.
(DaveS) is everyone still in touch with this? Does everyone understand this? Or rather, is there anyone who doesn't?
No-one
(DaveS) So let's move it to open.
Action: (BryanM) Move to open.
(DaveS) Are there any other new issues?
None.

Issue resolution

WSRF175: Add InitialValues section to RMD
(IanR) This was resolved by ballot: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/ballot.php?id=1012

Dan posted a resolution to include InitialValues and there was some discussion and we changed from the term 'Default' values to 'Initial' Values.

(DaveS) We had below 50% voting on this

(IanR) The majority of those voting voted yes.

(DaveS) But do we need a majority of voting members? What's the quorum?

(MartinC) I don't think the ballot was quorate. We could treat the ballot as a meeting, and use lack-of-vote like lack-of-attendance.

(DaveS) To keep it simple, let's have a vote right now. The proposal introduces Initial values that are distinct from Static values. Any questions?

None.
(DaveS) Any objections to making a motion?

None.

(DaveS) Any objections to the motion?

(BryanM) I want to abstain.

(Latha~~ily~~) I want to abstain, too.

Action: (BryanM) Move to Resolved.

WSRF176: Simplification of metadataDescriptorLocation type
(IanR) Currently the metadatadescriptorLocation is a list of pairs or URIs, with the first-in-pair a namespace names, and the second-in-pair a location of the metadataDescriptor

document which populates the namespace. However, we can have only metadataDescriptor document, so we need to change the type of the location attribute to be a single URI indicating the location.

(DaveS) It's not like we removing anything: the first URI of the pair (the namespace name) is implicit, because there is only one.

(IanR) Right. This is something that just go left out when we simplified RMD a while ago.

(DaveS) Are there any objections to accepting the resolution as described in the proposal?

None.

Action: (BryanM) Move to resolved.

(DaveS) Are there any problems with making the change, Dan?

(Dan) No.

WSRF174: Metadata Descriptor Instance as Resource Property
Useful summary: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200604/msg00030.html

(DaveS) This is about including a copy of the MDD in the resource directly. The latest proposal is that we (optionall) include in the Resource Properties of a resource, an EPR to another WS Resource which the client can use to obtain the metadataDescriptor.

There were several options that were discussed about the format of the target of the EPR Currently, Tim, Ian and I have agreement about option (d) in the email above where the EPR points to a Definitions element.

Some of the ramifications are that the easiest way to get the whole document is to use getResourcePropertiesdocument, but the information can be got by other means using various references such as wsdl location, interface name and namespace prefixes.

(IanR) What this essentially means is that if a client has a need to get the metadata for a particular instance, going via the EPR and getResourceProperty-on-MDD-element will be sufficient in most cases. All dynamic information will be there. Any static information (on the Definitions element) can be got in other ways.

(DaveS) Right, so there could be multiple Property Elements, and queryRP might be needed to pick them out. GetRP will get the whole MDD element. I think this is a reasonable compromise over the various alternatives. Any questions?

None

(DaveS) If we do resolve this would we be able to implement the changes and vote for a committee draft next time?

(Dan) So, for 30th, I think so, Yes.

(DaveS) Well, a little before hand so that a couple of people could look at it.

(IanR) Well 29th is the next meeting, and it's memorial Day. Let's target the 12th June.

(DaveS) I will look at it. Anyone else?

(IanR) I will, too.

(BryanM) Me too.

(DaveS) So are there any objections to making a motion here?

None

(DaveS) And are there any objections to resolving this issue as described by option (d) in the email referenced above?

None.

Action: (BryanM) Move to resolved.

(DaveS) So, do we have enough information to implement this?

(Dan) Yes.

(IanR) This is the last open issue. If we can have the new RMD draft a week before 12th, and vote for committee draft on 12th June, then how much further should we go with it? Will we have three companies with implementations necessary for the oasis spec stage?

(DaveS) I think Committee spec would be far enough, then we can see what the interest is – we might find it hard to get the votes out at the member voting stage.

(Dan) Do we need three independent implementations, or three companies working on the same implementation? IBM and HP are participating in Apache MUSE.

(IanR) it needs to be three member organisations. Why don't I send out the call for ratification right now, and we can judge from the response where we should go.

(DaveS) We need this for WSDM, yes?

(IanR) Yes.

(BryanM) I thought there was some requirement from the grid community, too.

(DaveS) Right, but the grid community is absorbed by the convergence document.

Action: (IanR) Send out call for ratifications.

Straggler Roll Call – see Meeting record.

Closed 17:45.

The next scheduled meeting (29th May) is canceled.
Next telecon is in four weeks on 12th June.

Summary of actions

(BryanM) Move issue 175 to resolved.
(BryanM) Move issue 176 via open to resolved.
(BryanM) Move issue 174 to resolved.
(Dave/Ian/Bryan) Review updated RMD ready for CD vote.

Action: (IanR) Send out call for successful usage of the RMD spec.