

Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC teleconference 24th January 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=4812

Approval of minutes from the previous teleconference call (10th January)

See <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/10950>

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

Call for AOB

(DaveS) Do we need to discuss the 'reference properties' issue of WS Addressing? Did anybody attend that meeting?

(Tom Rut) I was there.

(Mark Peel) Me too.

(DaveS) Ok – we'll do that before the main issue review.

Action Review - Dave

(MartinC): Write a clarification of the requirement for issue 64. (Post Schema Validation)

(Carried fwd from 29th Nov.) In progress, carry until Face-to-face.

(Bryan) Move issues WSRF 86, 87, 88 to open. **Done.**

(Interop Testers) Confirm implementations, outlook for availability & contact names via mail list. Carry fwd until next call.

(Bryan) Move issue 66 to 'deferred', issue 68 to 'resolved'. **Done**

(Charis) Carry forward discussion of issues WSRF72, 64, 79.

New Issues - Bryan

See http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrp/download.php/11117/WSRF_IssuesList.doc

WSRF90: OriginatorReference is ambiguous

(DaveS) it sounds like something that we should debate.

No objections.

Action: (Bryan) Move to open.

Deleted: 89

Deleted: BaseFault originator field

Progress on interop document - Tim

Some changes have been made to the scenarios document/wsdll/xsd and these have been publicized via the mailing list and are on the web site. The process for updating is for TimB to respond to comments on the mailing list and create a new version. We need to control this process one implementations start to mature. Participants should comment if proposed changes become a problem.

(DaveS) This process was proposed via the email list.

(TimB) The implementers from the discussion on the last conference call or the email list are:

Organisation	Implementation/base	Contact Names	Contact Email	Availability
Fujitsu	Unicore/Apache	Dave Snelling	David.Snelling@uk.fujitsu.com	Possibly end of February
HP		Salvatore Campana		
IBM	Websphere	Rick Rineholt		Estimated end of February
Globus	GlobusC/Apache		slang@mcs.anl.gov	
Globus	GlobusPython/Apache		krjackson@lbl.gov	
Globus	GlobusJava/Apache		gawor@mcs.anl.gov	
University of Virginia	WSRF.net	Glen Wasson	gsw2c@cs.virginia.edu	

(TimB) Any news from CA?

(Igor) Yes, we should be able to do it.

(TimB) There is also a possibility of participation by a UK e-Science group.

XTech Conference

See: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrp/email/archives/200501/msg00039.html>

Requesting presenters at the conference on 24 May, Amsterdam

(DaveS) People should follow up by the next meeting with Dave if there is any interest.

Action: (DaveS) reply to the invitation

Agenda prep for F2F.

(KatyW) Can we discuss Appnotes?

(DaveS) Yes,

Action (DaveS) Add this to the agenda.

Effects of the 'Reference Properties' decision in WS-Addressing

(TomR) After a lot of discussion, reference properties were removed, but reference parameters were kept. These are put in the EPR and are echoed back to the server. I asked about using the ref parms, and there is nothing to prevent their use as identifiers. So, we could use ref parms whose semantics are defined by WSRF, not by WS-Addressing.

(IanR) That's the same message we got via IBM.

(MarkP) Yes, that's right.

(Unit) It's not clear that parameter is what we should use. The spec doesn't say what should be done with them.

(TomR) The 'identity' word has been completely removed from the spec.

(Unit) What is interesting is the comparison definition.

(TomR) Ref Parmes are not in the comparison definition. **[2.4 Endpoint Reference Comparison]**. That would be part of the WSRF spec.

(Fred?) Wasn't it the case that the reference properties were absorbed into the uri?

(DaveS) Anyway, we should add a new Issue

(IanR) Shouldn't we wait until there's a new editors draft of WS-A?

(MartinC) Isn't this just another embodiment?

(Umit) Yes.

(SteveG) I think the major impact is in the non-normative examples. Everything else is encapsulated in the WS-Resource spec.

(TomR) The current version of WS-Addressing talks about reference parameters as the identification mechanism.

(DaveS) Ok, so do we need a new issue?

(IanR) If the WS-addressing draft is out before next week, we could have a discussion. Otherwise we would have only a speculative discussion.

(Umit) We still can raise an issue.

Action: (Bryan) Raise an issue, for discussion when the wsa editors draft comes out, highlighting the 'comparison' text for attention.

(Bryan) Should we have a separate issue to modify the text of the specs (examples and so on)?

(DaveS) Yes.

Review of Issues priorities document – Ian

This is posted to the list now. This new list is the order in which we tackle issues at the face-to-face meeting to get the first specs stabilized.

(DaveS) Shouldn't the model-level issues be high priority, too?

(IanR) Yes.

Action: (Ian) Update the priorities list.

Other Issues

WSRF64: Post Server Validation Infoset (PSVI) - Pending input from Martin.

Carry fwd pending clarification from MartinC.

WSRF72: Add operation: PutResourcePropertiesDocument

(Igor) Most of the disagreement here is on the semantics for the put, and what this does to the RP document, and what information is sent in the request, and what are the reconciliation rules. The RP document itself can have properties which are mandatory and provided by the service itself. How would the service respond if these properties were supplied by the request? Non-determinism may occur, and is worrisome to some. It is somewhat religious, and we need to provide flexibility.

(DaveS) So, the questions are the semantics, and whether we want this at all. The response that comes back is also an issue. My feeling is that PutResourceProperties document is a rat's nest. Is there a use case to guide us?

(Igor) Yes. Suppose we have a customer record that needs to be replaced? It could be sent wholesale as one would do on the web. We don't want to get into the business of individual properties.

(IanR) The problem comes when the properties document can't be 'put'.

(Igor) We can't tie down what happens to the information. We can only tie down the message exchange.

(steveG) What is that's known to both parties?

(Igor). The service sends 'Success' or 'Fault'. Fault can happen any time. If 'Success', then the service includes 'Document is as supplied in the request' or 'Update was processed, but this is the new version of the document'. The implementation can decide what happens, as it can always to: the message exchange does not affect this.

(SteveG) There a lot of client code needed to understand what happened.

(Igor) It's the same as sending multiple inserts which have side effects. The client may need to retrieve the whole document to discover what happened.

(IanR) In the case of set/update, the response is always a fault if the request fails.

(Igor) That's not the issue. It's what happens when the request succeeds – there may be side effects besides changing the property explicitly included in the request.

(DaveS) Yes, that's right in respect of update. What about read-only values?
(SteveG) Almost all documents will be read-only in some respects. How do we know what the client intended – update to X or leave as it is (whatever that is)?
(IanR) The fault can only be 'nothing was done'.
(DaveS) SetResourceProperty describes what has and hasn't changed. We could be more vague about Set and therefore be consistent in style.
(Igor) I can go with that. WE can so semantics later, but success will indicate the RP document is exactly as in the request.
(TomM) Perhaps we should say 'Equivalent' – meaning that it's canonical form is the same.
(DaveS) So the semantics are 'it all worked' or 'it broke', and can be consistent with set?
Any Objections?
(TomM) I don't object to the Put, but the fault needs to explain what went wrong.
(DaveS) Set returns the part that didn't work
(Igor) So this is part of it.
Action (Igor): To write up the proposal based on this discussion.

WSRF79: portType composition and properties document composition

(Igor) We shouldn't be telling people how to construct the RP document.
(TimB) Isn't that a different issue? Number 88?
(Igor) Ok, It's about Section 4.4 of the ResourceProperties spec and how to do composition: this shouldn't be normative text.
(IanR) Should we simply use this section as a section in AppNotes?
(Igor) We would also need to remove text that references this section.
(SteveG) Yes, there are some sections and detailed text.
(DaveS) Are there any objections to moving the text?
(TomM) Is it all of 4.4, or the fact that we say that the GED has to be copied. Couldn't we just loosen things up instead of obliterating it?
(SteveG) We could just say use and GED, and whatever else you need, but if there is merging of portTypes there are difficulties in the future (for the services which are extensions). The tradeoff is freedom vs extensibility in the future. Currently the choice is to restrict the form in order to enable extensibility.
(Igor) So if we go for extensibility, can we describe all of the valid techniques?
(SteveG) That is what we have now.
(Igor) But mixing can be done with model groups and model extensibility.
(SteveG) Many tools don't deal with model groups, and type extensibility is single inheritance.
(Igor) but WSDL 2.0 is single inheritance.
(SteveG) Maybe for services, but portTypes have multiple inheritance.
(Igor) Even so, single inheritance is still a useful thing.
(SteveG) So, where do we weight WSRF? Freedom or future extensibility?
(DaveS) We could put all of this in the AppNotes. If someone doesn't read it, the services won't be extensible – that sounds like a profile/best practice rather than a spec issue. And this will change in WSDL 2.0.

(SteveG) Well, in WSDL 2.0 we need to reason about portType extension and what this means for ResourceProperties.
(DaveS) So we should rip it out.
(SteveG) ...and there will be some RP docs that don't migrate forwards.
(DaveS) So this should be in the spec? Where do we go: perhaps a straw poll at the face-to-face?
(MartinC) We just need a motion.
(Igor) I think it needs more discussion.
(DaveS) We need to discuss this at the face-to-face.
(IanR) I think we should combine issue 79 and 88.
(TomM) Seconded.
Action: (Bryan) Combine the issues into one.
(IanR) We should discuss this further: we need to refine the text or move it out into AppNotes.
Action: (Chairs) Continue discussion of issue 79/88 at the face-to-face.

(DaveS) Any more burning issues, like logistics for the face to face?

Meeting closed 13:26 est. Next meeting is the face-to-face on 2nd Feb at IBM, Raleigh.

Summary of actions

(MartinC): Write a clarification of the requirement for issue 64. (Post Schema Validation)
(Carried fwd from 29th Nov.) In progress, carry until Face-to-face.
(Bryan): Move issue wsrf90 to open.
(Interop Testers): Confirm implementations, outlook for availability & contact names via mail list. (Carried fwd from 10th Jan)
(Chairs): Add an item to the face-to-face agenda: discuss the Appnotes document.
(DaveS) Reply to the XTech conference invitation
(Bryan): Raise two new issues, for discussion when the new wsa editors draft comes out:
1) Implications of the change – including the effect of the 'Comparison' text - for WS Resource spec and 2) Implications for example messages in other specs.
(Ian): Update the priorities list (model-level issues are high priority).
(Igor): To write up the proposal for issue 72 based on the discussion on 24th Jan.
(Bryan) Combine issues 79 and 88 into one.
(Chairs) Continue discussion of issue 79/88 at the face-to-face.

Deleted: 89