

Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC teleconference 18th April 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=4818

Approval of minutes from the last conf call (4th April)

See <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/12236>

(IanR) Are there any comments on the minutes?

None

(IanR) Are there any objections to approving the minutes?

None

Call for AOB

(IanR) Any additions needed for the agenda?

None

Action Review

(IanR) Prepare WSRF TC summary foils for New Orleans. **In Progress.**

(Bryan) Move wsrfl04 to open. **Done**

(IanR) Identify which issues are included in the latest drafts. The reviewers to be appointed at the next call. >> Ian/Bryan have done validation without issue except for wsrfl63 which has been updated. 63 needs work in AppNotes. 8 issues have impacts on WS-Resource and need a reviewer: TomM will review issues noted in: <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200504/msg00005.html>

(Bryan). Move issues wsrfl91 and wsrfl92 to Resolved. Both to adopt the 'last call' level of WS-Addressing. **Done**

(All TC Members) Review WS-Addressing and post comments to the list by the next conf call. *None received.*

(Bryan) Move issue wsrfl99 to 'resolved'. **Done**

(Bryan) Open new issue on providing advice for the binding of Basefaults to SOAP Faults. **Done**

(Sam) Investigate documenting recommendations/examples for the binding of Basefaults to SOAP faults. **Carry fwd via Issues List.**

(Bryan) Move issue wsrfl100 to 'resolved'. **Done.**

(BryanM) Create an issue to discuss the removal of WS-MD from WS-Resource. **Done**

(BryanM) Move issue wsrf101 to 'resolved'. **Done**

(IanR) Create a ballot for attendance at the May face-to-face meeting. **Done.**

New Issues (Bryan)

(IanR) Wsrf 107 was raised as a result of the last call. Any objections to opening this?
None.

Action: (Bryan) Move wsrf107 to open.

(IanR) wsrf108 is about which documents should be at the namespace URL

(TomM) WS-A and WSDL are considering using

(IanR) but we have our wsdl/xsd at the namespace urls.

(MartinC) This is still under discussion at W3C

(IanR) Proposed: not to open this.

(TomM) We should close the issue and keep on record that we considered RDDDL as a possibility.

(IanR) So the proposal is to close the issue with no action.

No objections.

Action: (Bryan) move to closed

Issue review – Chair

WSRF102: InvalidDeleteResourcePropertiesRequestContent needed

(IanR) This seems very reasonable. Why don't we have this fault?

(SteveG) It's because the delete request has only the QName as content, and we have a 'wrong QName' fault.

(BrianM) But it could be that the document fails to validate.

(SteveG) We have generic 'RequestFailed' and 'UnableToModify', but the point is that the delete message is valid, but the document is no longer validateable – a parallel to the Insert/Update faults.

(TomM) Could we make the fault for 'Insert' at line 1304 in the current spec more generic in terms of wording, but keep this sense.

(SteveG) Proposed to create a more generic fault.

(TomM) Seconded.

No objections.

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved.

WSRF103: Multiple Service Port elements legitimate?

(WilliamV) WSDL allows multiple ports into a service element which would allow the original portType name to be retrieved by requesters.

(IanR) So, the assumption would be that the resource visible to the client is the aggregate of all the portTypes' RP documents. The proposal would be to write this up as a best practice, but it would need to be mandatory behaviour if requesters are to rely on it.

(TimB) This proposal seems to change the definition of the wsrf portTypes which are written in terms of the ResourceProperties attribute.

(WilliamV) This would change the definition in the case that there is an aggregation of ports in a service.

(IanR) We need to refine the proposal of March 30th to define the root element of the RP document.

(WilliamV) But we don't need to define the root element – it can be discovered by asking for the RP document.

(IanR) This is a WSDM scenario, Yes?

(WilliamV) yes

(IanR) If we put this into AppNotes as a best practice recommendation; would this be sufficient? Also we need to review the normative text to see what will be affected.

Action: (Spec authors) to review the impact.

(IanR) After this is done, we need to decide how much to expose in the specs (and possibly make them more complex for what seems to be an edge case) vs what goes in AppNotes.

Remaining issues Postponed – Dave Snelling/Sam Meder not on the call.

Straggler Roll Call and Close

Closed 13:16 est

Summary of actions

(TomM) Review issue resolutions implement in WS-Resource and noted in:

<http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrp/email/archives/200504/msg00005.html>

(Bryan) Move wsrf107 to open.

(Bryan) Move wsrf108 to closed (no action)

(Bryan) Move wsrf102 to resolved.

(Spec authors) to review the impact of Williams proposal on the normative text.