

Notes from the OASIS WSRF TC teleconference 2nd May 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=7735

Confirm minute taker

Call for minute taker since Tim is gone: Bryan drafted

Approve minutes of April 18th telecon

See: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/12327>

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

Call for AOB

None.

Action Review

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

<http://www.oasisopen.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200504/msg0005.html> **Done**

(Bryan) Move wsrf107 to open. **Done**

(Bryan) Move wsrf108 to closed (no action) **Done**

(Bryan) Move wsrf102 to resolved. **Done**

(Spec authors) to review the impact of Williams proposal on the normative text. – to be talked about later in the context of issue 103

New issues to consider - Bryan

- Issue WSRF109 “Clarify authoritative precedence earlier”
 - do we want precedence to be pseudo-schema first?
 - not clear what the required precedence is in the current doc
 - should the text take precedence over pseudo-schema?
 - WSDL has an example where schema was changed at last minute

Action: Bryan – move to Open

Feed back from New Orleans

- WSRF was not presented due to mix-up in slides – wsrf was early
- music was good

- lightning round was interesting, but many presenters went over time

Comments on App Note resolutions.

See: http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrp/download.php/12346/DraftAppNotesIssues63_95_22_52_89.doc

any comments on the resolutions should be sent to the email list
Everyone should read through this document in the next week
Katy will merge this document into AppNotes doc
Action: (spec authors) – review AppNotes additions document

Face-to-Face Agenda items

(IanR) We need to work on candidate committee drafts.
We need more progress on ServiceGroups and resource metadata specs.
Need to validate where we are with Appnotes and Primer.
(DaveS) I would say we need to be ready for committee drafts by the end of the meeting, with enough detail for the authors to be ready for ballot the week after.
(IanR) We should prepare by getting all currently resolved issues implemented.
(DaveS) I agree that getting committee drafts is the major goal – does anyone disagree.
No-one does.
(DaveS) What about metadata.
(TomM) It is suffering from lack of attention.
(DaveS) We should spend time on rationalizing it to the point where we can start to raise issues.
(IanR) Do we have time for a new version before the face-to-face?
(William) What changes are we anticipating?
(TomM) We intend to make proposals to simplify it.
(IanR) Why don't we set up a call for those interested in metadata to discuss proposals.
Who will join?
(Several will)
Action: (IanR/TomM) Organise the call and advertise via the TC web site.
(IanR) do we need something on the Primer, too?
(TimB) Yes, I will post the current version, and we should use a little time to get feedback.

Issue review - Chair

WSRF103: Multiple Service Port elements legitimate?

See proposal from Tom and William <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrf/email/archives/200504/msg00020.html>

(TomM) We had a call last week where we discussed metadata to identify the origin of operations in aggregated portTypes. The proposal is to put something in Appnotes to recommend use of wsa:action attributes in the input element, and a normative change to the specs to use wsa:action instead of soapAction in the spec operations.

(DaveS) We have until now isolated the effect of WS-Addressing to WS Resource. We are now going to use it as a normative reference in all specs. This is a little uncomfortable, since the portType shouldn't deal with bindings and headers, but it is a good way to preserve the information.

(IanR) So, is that enough discussion?

(DaveS) Is anyone opposed to the proposal

None

(DaveS) Any abstentions?

One abstention

Action (Bryan) move to resolved

WSRF106: Not clear how to map faults for SOAP 1.1 and SOAP 1.2 Faults

(DaveS) I suggest we create non-normative examples in the base-faults specs and create an interop scenario which we can test. Are there any other endpoints around now?

None.

(IanR) I agree we should test it, but we should go ahead with the change.

DaveS) So the proposal is examples in the base-faults spec and in the interop doc.

(IanR) Seconded.

(DaveS) Any objections or abstentions

None

Action: (Bryan) Move to resolved

WSRF107: Consider whether the WS-MessageDelivery embodiment is needed

(DaveS) What is the status – Tom?

(TomR) It's still a submission to WS-Addressing.

(IanR) We should do this at the face-to-face

(Umit) The Oracle people should be there.

(DaveS) So let's defer this.

WSRF104: Content Rule Applies in Two Ways

(DaveS) The rules are ambiguous about whether the content comes exactly from the registration, or whether it can be derived from the content or generated by the ServiceGroup.

(TomM) The proposal is to remove line 453. "Delete this component must..."

(DaveS) Yes.

(TomM) I second that.

(DaveS) Are there any objections/absentions.

None.

Action: Move to resolved.

WSRF105: ServiceGroupEntry as a WS-Resource is too Heavyweight

(DaveS) This is complex issue and involves major changes. Should we open this?

(William) I think we should open it.

(DaveS) Any objections?

None.

Action: Move to Open

Straggler Roll Call

Close

Closed 13:20.

Next scheduled phone call (16th May) is cancelled: the face-to-face meeting will replace it.

Summary of actions

(Bryan) Move issue WSRF109 to open

(Spec authors) – review AppNotes additions document at http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsrfl/download.php/12346/DraftAppNotesIssues63_95_22_52_89.doc

(IanR/TomM) Organise a call on RMD advertise via the TC web site.

(Bryan) move issues WSRF103, WSRF106, WSRF104 to resolved

(Bryan) move issues WSRF105 to open.