

Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC face to face meeting 2nd to 4th February 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/wsrf/event.php?event_id=6712

Approval of minutes from the previous teleconference call (24th January)

See <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/11206>

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

Action Review

(MartinC): Write a clarification of the requirement for issue 64. (Post Schema Validation)
(Carried fwd from 29th Nov.).

(MartinC) This is a non-issue. The issue can be closed.

(Bryan): Move issue wsrf90 to open. **Done**

(Interop Testers): Confirm implementations, outlook for availability & contact names via mail list. (Carried fwd from 10th Jan)

GlenD/MartinC would like to participate.

(Chairs): Add an item to the face-to-face agenda: discuss the Appnotes document. **Done**

(DaveS) Reply to the XTech conference invitation. No offers received – interested parties should reply directly to the email: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/wsrf/200501/msg00039.html>

(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.

Done (91/92)

(Ian): Update the priorities list (model-level issues are high priority). **Done**

(Igor): To write up the proposal for issue 72 based on the discussion on 24th Jan.

(Bryan) Combine issues 79 and 88 into one. **Done**

(Chairs) Continue discussion of issue 79/88 at the face-to-face. **See below**

Call for AOB

None

Follow-on planning

Set up date and location for next F2F.

The suggestion is (noon-noon) Mon/Tue/Wed, 16/17/18 May

Venue to be investigated (possibly Dublin)

Roadmap for committee drafts of WS-Resource, WSRF-RP, WSRF-RL, WSRF-BF

(IanC) We should try to resolve most of the issues during this meeting. We should proceed to committee drafts to WSRAP/RP/BF/RL. Then we should start work on ServiceGroup/Metadata.

Once we have committee drafts, we should extend the interop scenario to, update to that level, and to include scenarios that test basefaults.

(MartinC) Can we stagger the votes to spread the workload.

(MartinC) We can't do WSRAP until WS-Addressing is settled.

(GlenD) We should try and track WS-Addressing

(DaveS) There is an issue to discuss this.

(IanR) The committee drafts could be static until we finish with ServiceGroups/Metadata, or move them to public comment before that.

(MartinC) Committee drafts are a stable point, we need review/test/correction/new drafts. When would this happen?

(DaveS) We have to get experience from the testing, perhaps June.

(IanR) Should we base interop tests on the next level of specs, as at the end of this week?

(DaveS) We should wait until the end of the week to see how we've done.

(IanR) We should also aim to have AppNotes and the Primer ready at the same time as the Committee drafts.

Issue review:

WSRF86 – WSRF specs need to include the faults from WS-RAP (Resource Unknown) in their portTypes

(GlenD) In WSDL 2, we will have faults defined at the interface level. Also definition of the message isn't needed – any message can be sent.

(IanR) There are two points – one for the applications, and one for the specs.

(TomM) The definition, the semantic and the use across the specs need to be defined.

(SteveG) We should also review all the fault definitions in the spec and make them more uniform and detailed.

Action: Raise a new issue (This will be 93) to review Faults.

(TomM) I don't like the 'resource identifier' in the proposed text.

(SteveG) The editors should fix that.

(TimB) The debateable issue is whether the fault should be mandatory or 'recommended'.

(MartinC) The last sentence (application specific faults may be substituted) seems wrong.

(SteveG) We should replace the sentence with a recommendation to derive a more informative fault.

(IanR) In summary, 'resource identifier in the message' should be replaced by 'resource identified by the message', the last sentence should say 'the fault may contain additional application-specific information'.

(GlenD) This is strange – the fault is about a system problem, not an application problem.

(IanR) .We could specify these faults on WSRF specification operations or take them out and having the fault described in text. We should vote on the motion that the faults are specified in the WSDL.

Carried.

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved with the amended text.

WSRF89: Document-literal serialization

(GlenD) There are lots of Web services that use RPC. Are those implementations unable to use WSRF?

(SteveG) We should close this with no action. The question is about WS-I BP compliance. Services that want to interoperate should be compliant.

(DaveL) The specs use element form messages, so the RPC form doesn't work. There is no need to say anything.

(IanR) The resolution is that it should be stated in the Appnotes that the Document Literal is the only serialization that is possible for the spec operations. Any objections?

None.

Action (Bryan) Move to Resolved

WSRF92: Update examples to be compliant with the recent version of WS-Addressing

(IanR) We need to decide to bring the examples up to date. This means changing 'reference properties' to 'reference parameters', and when.

(MartinC) We should wait until WS-Addressing is settled.

(DaveS) If we adopt reference parameters, we might be a non-approved space in the Web services community. We need to review when the debate has settled, so we should postpone this.

Action: (Bryan) Move to open, with the recommendation to do nothing.

WSRF93: Review fault messages

(IanR) Are there any objections to doing this?

No objections.

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved.

WSRF77: Clarification needed in WS-Resource embodiment for WSDL (section 3.4)

(Igor) Resolution has been posted. See: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/wsr/200412/msg00030.html>

(SteveG) Let's compare with the requirements of an embodiment: it must identify a resource, but the several ports might be pointing to different resources,

(Igor) Right, so we need to clarify: the first sentence should say that all ports provide access to the same resource.

(SteveG) The embodiment has to say where the identifiers go, but the description doesn't say where.

(IanR) For WS addressing we know the identifier goes in the address or a reference property of the header. For this embodiment, we don't know.

(Igor) The rules of WSDL and Policy and so on, say what needs to be done.

(Umit) This embodiment seems to be useless. It doesn't say where the identifiers go.

(Igor) This embodiment is designed to allow people to use existing WSDL mechanisms (say an x.509 certificate in a security header.).

(Umit) It isn't possible to make a test suite to check this compliance.

(IanR) The first WSDL embodiment was more specific – encoding the identifier in the port/soap:address. Was it a good idea to subsume this embodiment in the more generic description?

(SteveG) How is the new proposal different from embodiment 2 in the original document?

(Igor) It says that the resource identifier is prescribed by the rules of the WSDL definitions element. The wsa embodiment says that the identifier is part of the WSA address. This is similar.

(IanR) Who is going to use this?

(SueM) The DAIS people wanted to use it, but we concluded that it wasn't possible.

(IanR) We could decide to defer this and resolve details later.

(Igor) This would prevent us using WSRF without WSA and using security headers in regular web services to identify the resource.

(SamM) Can we be more precise – why not just say it has to be in the header?

(Igor) Which header perhaps the soap, or the http header?

(DaveS) What we need is an invitation to new embodiments.

(SteveG) There is one already: “Applications may define additional embodiments” I propose that we drop this section (3.3), create a new issue addressing a potential the WSDL 1.1 binding element embodiment, and that the new issue is deferred.

(MartinC) Seconded.

Carried.

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved, and create a new issue which is to be deferred to the next version. (PS: the new issue is WSRF94)

Deleted: :

Deleted:

Deleted: it

WSRF91: Resource Access Pattern reaction to the removal of ReferenceProperties.

(IanR) We should treat this the same as 92

No Objections.

Action: (Bryan) Move to open.

WSRF55: Define a topic for notifications on the change of any resource property

(TomM) Can't this be done with wildcard topics?

(SteveG) No: the resource properties may be in different namespaces, so also different topicspaces.

(TomM) Couldn't we weave together a topicspace from the different topicspaces.using the 'extends' mechanism recently introduced in BaseNotification.

(SteveG) Yes: A requestor could subscribe to “wsrf:wellKnownTopic//.” which contains all topics published resourceproperty changes. Call this option 3. An alternative (option 2) is to create a well-known topic with it’s own semantics.

(SamM) A propoerty’s topicspace (namespace) might already be an extension. It can’t be an extension of two topicspaces.

(GlenD) We have to say there are two events caused by the same situation. One is the property change event in the wellKnownTopic, and another in the other topicspace.

(DaveS) Does anyone like this use case?

(WilliamV) Yes.

(SteveG) Yes.

(DaveS) The difference between option 2 and 3 (option 1 is do nothing) is that

(Bryan) The problem with extends is we’ll be defining the topics corresponding to the resource properties which never publish any events. I want to be able to subscribe to the individual resource changes under their own names.

(SteveG) And for option 2, the event is produced twice.

(IanR) The motion is to adopt the well-known topic without the ‘extends’ mechanism. Carried.

(SteveG) The proposed resolution is a change to section 6 of the RP spec that’s needed is to say that events that are already produced by property changes, also appear on the well known topic which is “wsrf-rp:AnyResourcePropertyValueChange” .

No Objections.

WSRF72: Add operation PutResourcePropertiesDocument

(IanR) In the telecon on Jan 24th we decided the gist of the resolution. This is semantically the same as a SetResourceProperty where all the properties are being changed.

(TomM) But how do we know what has changed – it is a canonicalised comparison? And note that a change to the same value of properties will generate change notifications.

(SteveG) I understand what needs to done. If as a result of

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved.

WSRF79/ WSRF88: portType composition and properties document rules of assembly

(Igor) Steve says we need to provide rules by which we specify that the composition will work.

(Steve) We can move the section (4.4) into the appnotes document.

(MartinC) As per the proposed resolution.

No objections.

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved

WSRF83: Value change notification clarification

(IanR) Should change notifications be for any change, or only an explicit set? The semantics of ‘change’ to be defined by the service.

No Objections.

(Bryan) Section 6 2nd paragraph needs to change.

(SteveG) Right: remove the parenthesis and qualify 'observing the messages' to mean the subscription messages, and that clarify that changes can be the result of third party events. No objections.

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved.

WSRF19: Allow relative time (duration) in addition to absolute time for TerminationTime property

(IanR) The issue is whether we should be able to set TerminationTime as a value relative to the current time.

(DaveS) We need to have a SetTerminationTime that can work with a relative time period.

(BryanM) The properties should be CurrentTime and Termination time (as it is today) and the SetTerminationTime operation should take a union of DateTime and Duration, and Duration should be interpreted as relative to the CurrentTime.

(IanR) Should we have union or separate operations.

(Igor) This is hard for serialisers. It needs to use xsi:type.

(TimB) This makes a problem for code generation.

(DaveS) It would be easier for clients to have two operations.

(IanR) So the proposal is a new operation: SetTerminationDuration.

(PeterN) That's not how we do it in Notification – we use union.

(IanR) So we vote on the proposal for a Union in one operation.

Defeated.

(IanR) Now let's vote on the proposal for a new operation called SetTerminationDuration.

Carried.

Meeting Adjourned at 17:46 2nd Feb

Resumed 8:30 3rd Feb

Application Notes – Katy Warr

We need to review the structure and contents and figure out how the material can be written with help for specific topics.

Section 1 is resource definition which will use the printer example to line up with the primer.

Extension will be demonstrated by adding an admin portType, we need to deal with issue of identifying the origin of operations.

(SteveG) The operation name is the biggest clue to the origin and semantics of the operation. Where operation names collide the names must be changed.

(DaveS) Documentation should be used to identify the origin.

(Katy) Aggregating portTypes with properties of the same name but different cardinalities

(DaveS) This is a corner case; we can only warn people.

(IanR) We need to explain what it is about WSRF that need needs to be explained (compared to general Web services)

(Katy) Defining and generating base faults – we could use base faults as 1-way (not Notification) messages.

(SteveG) Is this really necessary – a good use of the readers time.

(DaveS) It seems useful, but if it's hard to write, we can lose this section.

(Katy) A base faults example could be

(GlenD) What's the purpose of the AppNotes.

(Katy) It's more of a usage reference rather than a narrative document with sustained example. It's the bits that won't go anywhere else.

(IanR) We should have a slim primer as the first point of information, and the AppNotes can be the more substantive document.

(Glen) in WSDL there is only a Primer, which works with consistent examples, but starts with simple cases and goes on to the more complex issues.

(Katy) Is there anything missing?

(DaveS) No.

(Katy) Best Practice examples... embodiments

(SteveG) Some explanation of the pros and cons of embodiments would be useful. An example of an application-defined embodiment, perhaps.

(SteveG) We need something about dynamic properties which can be created wherever there is an extensibility element, discovered by notification, and exploited via get/set..

(Katy) Notification. A notification example could be in the primer, but the 'any' change is App Notes, and the stuff about what triggers a notification.

(Katy) Security – this is from the state paper, but is it necessary?

(Katy) I need a volunteer to help with the WSDM event format for notifications.

(Bryan) I'll help.

(Igor) We need a wiki site or a blog where people with interest in a particular spec issue can write something and this would be source material for AppNotes.

Action: (Chairs) Ask OASIS for wiki site.

(IanR) But in the meantime, we have the email list.

Review remaining Action items

Xtech meeting – still needs a volunteer. – see email on 19th Jan,

Issues Review continues

WSRF95: Constraints on Properties document construction

(IanR) The proposal is to remove no attributes on root element, and not to insist that child elements must be ref'd. Any other issues?

(SteveG) The attribute restriction was because the root element couldn't be got, but now we have get/putResourceProperties document it makes sense – remove the second part of the first sentence.

(IanR) We need material in the AppNotes to explain what the RP document can look like – and we should improve our process for checking updates on that doc now we have a draft.

(SteveG) in Point 2/a, the ref restriction makes it easy to extend the document, but if people want to use legacy XML documents that should be allowed. We should change MUST to SHOULD.

(Igor) All we need to say is that child elements are GEDs.

(Glen) Do we need them to be GEDs?

(SteveG) We need the QName to be unique, that's not true if elements can be below global scope.

(MartinC) The statement in 4/b doesn't seem to add anything.

(Igor) And why do we insist on one child element at minimum.

(DaveS) The changes are: remove 2nd half of 1st sentence of 3.. In 4, 'one' becomes 'zero', in 4/a MUST becomes SHOULD and remove second half of sentence and remove 4/b entirely.

(Igor) Why do we say anything about the order of the properties?

(MartinC) Yes, It should just be XML.

(SteveG) This says that the order is not significant for WSRF. We could remove that, too.

(DaveS) Also, we need need to be clear about the use of the word 'document' – it should clarify instance vs schema.

(DaveS) Is everyone ok with these changes?

No Objections.

(SteveG) The part about child element aggregation being 'sequence or all' can go also. We could allow choice.

(MartinC) What do we return if a choice element is not present.

(SteveG) The same as if a minOccurs=0 does not occur.

(DaveS) Are there any objections to taking that out? This is the proposal now:

1.1 Resource Properties Document Type

A resource properties document MUST be defined using the following rules:

1. The root of the resource properties document MUST be a global element declaration (GED) in some XML namespace. This GED defines the type of the root element of a resource properties document and hence the type of the resource properties document itself.
2. The resource properties document MUST be uniquely identified by a QName.
3. The complexType defining the resource properties document MUST define element children only.
4. The complexType defining the resource properties document MUST define a collection of zero or more child elements, called resource property elements. Each child element MUST be a GED.
5. The complexType defining the resource properties document MAY allow

| open element content (xsd:any).

| Any Objections?

| No Objections.

| **Action** (Bryan) Move to resolved

WSRF19: Allow relative time (duration) in addition to absolute time for TerminationTime property

(DaveS) This needs to be reopened even though we closed it yesterday.

(SamM) One (new) issue is about the syntax of SetTerminationTime operation.

(Igor) Another proposal: the setTerminationTime should send the requesters current time This solves the problem that the receiver has no clock.

(Glen) We should have something simple and let optional mechanisms to solve synchronization and skew issues.

Proposed (Igor) That we have a new issue to discuss the representation of TerminationTime/CurrentTime.

(TomM) Seconded.

Motion Defeated.

(DaveS) Any objections to opening a new issue on the syntax of SetTerminationTime?

| **Action** (Bryan): Move to resolved

OBIX: Introduction and discussion of scenarios (Toby Considine)

The purpose of this session is for Toby to introduce the technology and for an informal discussion on potential use of WS-RF.

OBIX is all about people who do building controls; there are a variety of vendor-centric standards. Buildings have a lot of controls: heating, lighting, security, safety, fire prevention, and facilities are till very basic – for example inventory and scheduling of facilities like conference rooms cannot be done centrally, and such systems that do exist use communications that are nothing like computing system. This is a natural application for service-oriented architecture standards. WSDM should be a good model for this buildings stuff. We need a standard interface to existing building systems.

(SteveG) How can WSRF help?

(Tony) Perhaps review OBIX activity and guide it.

(Martin) How big is the committee?

(Toby) There are about 57 vendors participating.

(DaveS) and what's the current status –models, protocols or what?

(Toby) we have a list of functionality in terms of datatypes and general services and also a requirement to scale up today's simple systems. It's large scale, so possibly we need to consider WSDM and WS-Notification as the basis. WS Management is also a candidate for some people.

(IanR) What are the criteria for selecting technology?

(Toby) Mostly it's based on existing knowledge and enthusiasm for particular areas. We need more experience in the committee to make good choices.

(IanR) Should we have a reciprocal exchange at the next Obix face-to-face?

(Tony) The next meeting is in Dallas 21st March, (www.builconn.com) described on the Obix Web site.

Action: (Chairs) Identify and brief a delegate on the Obix committee. Note that questions about Obix, should email Tony at Toby.Considine@fac.unc.edu

WSRF19bis: New syntax for the SetTerminationTime.

(DaveS) Two operations is more complex, can we be more compliant with other specs (WS-BN)

(Umit) But this possibly doesn't work.

(IanR) Why are we suggesting Choice, not Union?

(Igor) because Union requires the type.

(Sam) The support of Choice is optional in the jaxrpc spec.

(Ian) We should make our own minds about this and not be influenced by precedence.

(DaveS) Let's vote on the motion to use choice.

Approved.

Action (Bryan) Move to resolved.

Action (Interop spec) Ensure this operation is tested.

WSRF63: Which lifetime attributes (ala OGSI) should be specified for resource properties

(DaveS) This would make the expression of information lifetime standard.

(SteveG) Could OGSA specify this?

(SteveG) We would need to review all the elements to enable the attributes.

Proposed (SteveG) that we don't define these attributes.

Carried.

(IanR) There are only a few attributes that we need to consider. In WS-RL there are two and in Servicegroup there are MembershipContentRule and Entry...

(Umit) We should make all our properties open attribute.

(DaveS) For example resolution of the clock on CurrentTime.

(DaveS) The proposal is to add anyAttribute extensibility to all ResourceProperties in the RL, RP and SG specs.

No Objections.

Action: more to Resolved and add reasoning to the Appnotes.

WSRF57: CurrentTime and TerminationTime types not consistently used by other WSDL/schema

(SamM) This isn't a big deal, We can close it without action.

No objections.

WSRF78: Should resource lifetime require WS-Resource?

(MartinC) This is about using WS-RL without being a WSRF

(SamM) It's a philosophical issue, but also concerns how WSRF and WS-BN compose. It would be nice to see a nicer factoring.

(MartinC) Can we define a portType with the lifetime operations, but define the semantics wrt the resource properties document.

(DaveS) Proposed to close with no action.
Carried.

WSRF85: The WS-ResourceLifetime WSDL portType needs to contain the attribute to refer to the resource properties document

(TimB) We only need to change the Scheduled Termination portType

(TomM) Yes, that's the proposal. I propose we resolve as described in the issue.

No objections.

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved.

(MartinC) Which of the spec document or the wsdl/xsd is normative.

(IanR) The proposal is that the spec is right and the wsdl is wrong. We need to update the Scheduled TerminationTime portType.

No objections.

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved.

(MartinC) We need to clarify which of the spec document fragments or appendix or wsdl/xsd is normative.

(samM) Seconded.

(IanR) The separate files are the ones that go through tools

(SteveG) but the appendix is the one at hand.

Proposed Amendment (Ian) that the separate files are the normative version.

Seconded (Tim)

Carried.

(DaveS) So, on the original motion is to add statements that declare the separate files as normative.

Carried.

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved. (This is now issue 96)

WSRF28: ErrorCode element comes close to having platform dependencies

(SteveG) There is nothing to say that the ErrorCode must be understood. It is informal information. The understanding is at the basefault QName.

(DaveS) Error code is a useful and common use pattern.

(Glen) There are other places to put fault codes, such as in SOAP.

(SamM) The element is defined minOccurs=0 – it can be left out.

(SteveG) We should close this with no action

(TomM) Seconded.

No objections.

Action (Bryan) Move to closed.

WSRF90: OriginatorReference is ambiguous

What is meant by this element?

(Katy) The last sentence of the definition “The outer-most fault may...” should be deleted and we need to change ‘the fault’ to ‘this fault’ in the first sentence.

Proposed (DaveS) we accept this proposal

Seconded (Tom)

No objections

Action (Bryan) Move to resolved

(MartinC) We are still referring to WS-Addressing endpoint reference in the specs when the embodiment work abstracted this issue. Shouldn't we have a wrapper like BPEL?

(GlenD) But WS addressing is nearly finished.

(MartinC) Ok, we have an issue on that and can deal with the whole thing together when we move from the Current WS-Addressing dependency.

WSRF22: QNames as attribute values or text nodes is problematic with signatures/encryption and intermediaries

(SteveG) The problem is optimization of messages by manipulating namespace prefixes that doesn't process strings such as occur in Resource Property request messages.

(PeterN) Yes, the digital signature issue is separate.

(SamM) The problem is with the string datatype- it should declare 'string with QNames', but the intermediaries which do manipulation don't understand this.

(PeterN) We could have an attribute for elements that can contain qnames that declares the prefixes.

(DaveS) Or we have namespaces spelled out in full.

(MartinC) I think the manipulation of namespaces should be illegal.

(MartinC) Should we close this with no action, but put something in AppNotes.

(SteveG) There are recommendations in XPath to make xpath queries immune.

(DaveS) any objections to this?

None.

Action: Move to resolved.

WSRF37: Version compatibility and specification evolution

(TomM) I propose we close this with no action.

(Glen) The answer is to use namespaces.

(DaveS) Any objections to closing this.

No objections

Action: (Bryan) Move to Closed.

WSRF39: Consider creating a WSDL 2.0 rendering

(MartinC) I propose we close this with no action.

(Sam) Seconded

No Objections.

Action. Move to closed.

WSRF62: Should the WS-RF specifications be WS-I Basic Profile 1.1 compliant?

(DaveS) We should put a statement in the specs to say that we are compliant.

(TomM) It would be in the wsdl.

(GlenD) I don't think that's required by WS-I.

(DaveS) So the proposal is to oput the statement in thespec.

(Sam) Seconded.

Action. (Bryan) Move to resolved.

(DaveS) That completes the list of unresolved actions.

(IanR) apart fromt e WS-Addressing ones

(Bryan) and some that come from emails on the ogsa-wg list.

[study of email]

(DaveS) I don't think we need an issue on this.

No Objectons.

(IanR) So we can resume the discussion of the roadmap for the new drafts, how to deal with WS-Addressing issues and Interop testing. We need a new namespace,

Action: (Ian) Send out editors instructions.

Issue WSRF29: Discuss reconciliation between UDDI, WSIL, WSDL collection of ports, and WS-ServiceGroups

(MartinC) This is discussing the scope of the TC – we should close with no action.

(DaveS) Any objections.

None.

Action: Move to Closed.

Issue WSRF38: Create a requirements document

(DavidL) We've done this – the issue is resolved.

No Objections.

Action: Move to closed.

Issue WSRF61: Decide whether to write a primer/app note/usage notes

(DaveS) This is done, it can be closed.

No Objections.

Action: Move to closed.

Issue WSRF73: Examine specifications to see if use of EPRs is necessary

(DaveS) thisis a little different to what we discussed earlier, because the EPR points to a WS resource.

(MartinC) I propose we close this because it will be obvious when we deal with the WS Addrssing issues that we need to fix this (nor not).

No objections.

Issue WSRF87: InitialTerminationTime in Add method needs to have stronger guarantee

(Sam) We should return the same thing that we return in setTerminationTime.

(DavidL) Seconded
No Objections.

Issue WSRF60: ServiceGroup XPath validity in question

(TomM) Proposed to close as documented in the proposal. This change is already implemented
(Sam) Seconded.
Action Move to closed.

Deleted: i

Issue WSRF69: Content should be declared with minOccurs="0"

This is about inconsistency, but which of the spec and the xsd is right?

(SamM) I propose we act as proposed on the issue text.

(Bryan) Seconded

No objections.

(TomM) Actually, we need to make content optional in two places – the ServiceGroup and the entry.

(DaveS) Are there any objections to making this amendment?

No objections.

Issue WSRF44: No obvious mechanism to include only members which extend a certain interface

(TomM) We need to come up with a proposal to solve this.

Action (TomM) Propose a resolution.

Revisit Requirements for reference renewal

(DaveS) We can satisfy the naming requirements of OGSI with renewable references, but not the rest of the requirements. The OGSA community have developed their own solution via a profile.

(IanR) We have in the charter that WS Resources might need references which are long-lived and need renewal.

(MartinC) There are other mechanisms to recover EPRs that go bad: it's a generic Web service thing – look in directories. I propose we remove this from our charter.

(TomM) Seconded

(DaveS) Does the meeting want to do this via an email vote to get the required majority?

No objections.

Action: (Chairs)

Meeting adjourned 17:32.

Resumed 09:00 Feb 4th

Presentation of ServiceGroup – Tom Maguire

What is the idea behind the representation of an “Entry” as the ServiceGroupEntry WS Resource?

(TomM) It exploits the Lifetime behaviour provided by WS-RL rather than provide a custom solution.

(TimB) There are similar uses of WS Resources to describe parts of a document, to exploit WS-RP on the parts.

Summary of actions

(Bryan) Move the following issues to ‘Resolved’: 86, 89, 93, 55, 72, 77, 79/88, 19, 63, 85, 96, 90, 62, 85, 87, 69.

(Bryan) Close issue 60

(Bryan) Create new issue to describe need for a WSDL 1.1 embodiment (from Issue 77) and defer it.

(Bryan) Move the following issues to ‘Closed, No action’: 57, 78, 28, 37, 39, 29, 38, 73

(IanR) Summarise actions and distribute to editors. **Done**

(Chairs) Organise email vote on charter change to remove Renewable References.

(Chairs) Investigate an OASIS-based Wiki site to assist development of AppNotes.

(Chairs) Identify and brief a delegate to the Obix committee.