

# Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC Teleconference 12<sup>th</sup> June 2006

## ***Agenda***

See: [http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsr/event.php?event\\_id=11818](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsr/event.php?event_id=11818)

## ***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/wsr/event.php?event\\_id=11818](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsr/event.php?event_id=11818)

The meeting was quorate.

## ***Confirm minute taker***

Tim Banks is taking the minutes.

## ***Approve minutes of Teleconference on 15<sup>th</sup> May***

See: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/18182>

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

## ***Call for AOB***

(DaveS) We need to talk about the next meeting. Is there anything else?

Nothing.

## ***Action Review - chair***

(BryanM) Move issue 175 to resolved. **Done**

(BryanM) Move issue 176 via open to resolved. **Done**

(BryanM) Move issue 174 to resolved. **Done**

(Dan) Produce updated RMD with agreed resolutions to all issues. **Done**

(Dave/Ian/Bryan) Review updated RMD ready for CD vote. **Done**

(Tim/Ian) Produce cd-02 of Primer and publish it on "docs" domain. **Done**

## ***New Issues***

None.

## ***Issue resolution***

No issues outstanding.

## ***Discuss updated RMD doc.***

(DaveS) Let's start with Ian's issues from the recent email: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrp/email/archives/200606/msg00002.html>

(IanR) At line 1131 this should be deleted, yes?

(DanJ) Yes, ok.

(IanR) Item 2, at line 1155. The pairsofURI type has been deleted: it needs to be put back OK?

(DanJ) Yes.

(IanR) Item 3 is about the EPR to a WS Resource, but we're missing that the RPDdoc must have a root element that's a Definitions with a single MetadataDescriptor child constrained by a MaxOccurs=1. This was "option (d)" from the last meeting.

(DanJ) Ok.

(IanR) And the fourth thing is that there's no stand-alone schema/wSDL.

(Dan) Ok.

(DaveS) Ok – what did Tim notice?

(TimB) In section 3.2.2 the example Identification portType is introduced with a metadatascriptor, and then an OperatingSystem portType with its MDD. The OS MDD talks about the properties as if they are additional to the Identification portType, but they aren't. The properties from the ID portType MDD must be copied into the OS MDD.

(DanS) Are there other things?

(TimB) Maybe there are, elsewhere in the example.

(DaveS) Or to the rest of the spec.

(BraynM) Probably the changes are in the example section.

(FredC) Well, on line 921 the word "specializes" should be removed.

(Dan) Ok.

(DaveS) Are there any other comments on the spec?

(BryanM) Are the references to the WS Resource spec correct?

(IanR) That's a good catch.

(DanJ) The WS Resource and WSRP refs need to be updated.

(DaveS) Are the schemas and namespaces correct.

(DanJ) Yes – it's just the textual reference.

(DaveS) Anything else?

None.

(DaveS) So we can either vote on the principal of what's just been discussed, or let Dan do changes and then vote via a ballot.

(DanJ) Let's do the latter.

(DaveS) Can this be done by the end of this week?

(DanJ) Ok.

**Action:** (Dan) Make updates to RMD spec agreed during the meeting

(DaveS) Ian, are you Ok with doing a ballot?

(IanR) Yes.

**Action:** (IanR) After updates are complete, arrange ballot for committee draft.

(DaveS) So, if we agree to go to Committee draft we could proceed with this through Public Review to Committee spec. Then we could go for an OASIS spec. However, given the marginal nature of this spec, and not being listed in our charter, we don't need to feel obliged to take it to OASIS standard. How do people feel?

(TomR) This seems to have mandatory stuff, so if we expect people to use these things, we need this to go to a full spec.

(DaveS) The problem is that we have interest in it, we have only one commitment to implement. Plus we had to work behind the scenes to get votes for the basic specs. I would be inclined to go to Committee Specification, since we get something stable as a reference point. Also, it's optional in the WSRF suite; we don't have to link it with the base.

(TomR) The optionality isn't the problem, it's the lack of implementors.

(IanR) Does everyone think we should go to Committee Spec?

(TomR) If we want people to implement, that is good thing to do.

(DaveS) Are there any objections to going to committee spec?

(TimB) Does the Committee Spec means anything if there are insufficient implementors?

(TomR) It is more stable than a Committee Draft. Sometimes CD is used as a freeze-point. Under the new OASIS rules, the Committee spec is something that is complete.

(TimB) Ok.

(DaveS) So the resolution is that we should go for Committee Specification and proceed though the public review. Any objections?

None.

(DaveS) So the ballot should say that we will accept the draft as Committee Draft and submit for public Review.

(IanR) Ok, but can you arrange the public review with OASIS?

(DaveS) Ok.

**Action:** (DaveS) Liaise with OASIS to organize the Public Review.

## ***Straggler Roll Call***

See Meeting record.

## ***AOB***

(DaveS) So we don't have anything for the agenda for next time.

(IanR) We should keep the call slot going until we are finished – we can cancel the calls, but we don't want people to reuse the time slot.

(DaveS) Right the default is that the meeting goes ahead – business as usual.

Next telecon is in two weeks (26<sup>th</sup> June).

Closed 6:35.

### ***Summary of actions***

(Dan) Make updates to RMD spec agreed during the meeting.

(IanR) After RMD updates are complete, arrange ballot to accept the spec as Committee Draft and submit for Public Review.

(DaveS) If the ballot succeeds, liaise with OASIS to organize the Public Review of RMD.