

## **Minutes for 08/03/2005 Conference Call**

### Agenda for this meeting:

- Today's call will be an hour shorter than usual – John has a conflict that he is unable to reschedule.
- Call for volunteers to take minutes
- Roll call/determine quorum
- Review and Approve Minutes from 7/27 and 7/20 meetings.
- Important Note: We are still looking for someone to host the 9/13-9/15 F2F (mid-west or eastern US). Contact us if you are interested.
- Update on wiki availability
- Subgroups reports (if any)
- Issue discussions (see <http://tinyurl.com/756gq> for a public mirror of all BPEL specification issues).
  - 157: [http://www.choreology.com/external/WS\\_BPEL\\_issues\\_list.html#Issue157](http://www.choreology.com/external/WS_BPEL_issues_list.html#Issue157)  
(Yaron)
    - Review findings and recommendations from Charleton's conference calls. We will be discuss and vote on Alex's proposal at <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsbpel/email/archives/200507/msg00118.html>. The original proposal is at <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsbpel/download.php/12860/157.htm>. (Note relationship to long running issues 51 and 11.)
  - 88: [http://www.choreology.com/external/WS\\_BPEL\\_issues\\_list.html#Issue88](http://www.choreology.com/external/WS_BPEL_issues_list.html#Issue88)  
(Yaron)
    - Paco's proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/wsbpel/200506/msg00209.html>  
Review and discuss Paco's clarifications (to be posted to the TC mailing list prior to our conf call). Discuss and possibly vote on Paco's proposal.
  - 169: [http://www.choreology.com/external/WS\\_BPEL\\_issues\\_list.html#Issue169](http://www.choreology.com/external/WS_BPEL_issues_list.html#Issue169)  
(Yuzo)
    - Yuzo's proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/wsbpel/200412/msg00034.html>
    - This issue is tabled until Satish and Frank Leyman are available on the call.
  - 82.3: [http://www.choreology.com/external/WS\\_BPEL\\_issues\\_list.html#Issue82.3](http://www.choreology.com/external/WS_BPEL_issues_list.html#Issue82.3)  
(Rania)

- Rania's proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/wsbpel/200507/msg00085.html>  
(Note relationship to long running issue 99.)
- Motions to open new issues
- Long running issues
  - 9: [http://www.choreology.com/external/WS\\_BPEL\\_issues\\_list.html#Issue9](http://www.choreology.com/external/WS_BPEL_issues_list.html#Issue9) (BPEL 1.1 authors)
    - Deferred pending inclusion of 84 in spec (84 was approved on 6/4/2004)
  - 125: [http://www.choreology.com/external/WS\\_BPEL\\_issues\\_list.html#Issue125](http://www.choreology.com/external/WS_BPEL_issues_list.html#Issue125) (Yuzo)
    - Yuzo's proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/wsbpel/200412/msg00027.html>
  - 51: [http://www.choreology.com/external/WS\\_BPEL\\_issues\\_list.html#Issue51](http://www.choreology.com/external/WS_BPEL_issues_list.html#Issue51) (Yaron)
    - Depends upon 157
  - 11: [http://www.choreology.com/external/WS\\_BPEL\\_issues\\_list.html#Issue11](http://www.choreology.com/external/WS_BPEL_issues_list.html#Issue11) (Danny)
    - Ugo proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/wsbpel/200503/msg00231.html>
    - Chris Keller proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/wsbpel/200504/msg00153.html>
    - Deferred pending resolution to 51, 157, maybe 125. Yaron to provide info on info set.
  - 99: [http://www.choreology.com/external/WS\\_BPEL\\_issues\\_list.html#Issue99](http://www.choreology.com/external/WS_BPEL_issues_list.html#Issue99) (Ivana)
    - Ivana's proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/wsbpel/200505/msg00053.html>
    - Deferred, pending 82.3
  - 6.2: [http://www.choreology.com/external/WS\\_BPEL\\_issues\\_list.html#Issue6.2](http://www.choreology.com/external/WS_BPEL_issues_list.html#Issue6.2) (Ivana, Alex)
    - Ivana's proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/wsbpel/200504/msg00007.html>
- Discuss agenda for next meeting
- New business

Minutes were taken by Assaf Arkin

- Meeting began at 8:10 AM PT.

- Minutes for 7/27 and 7/20 meetings were approved.
- John: We are still looking for people to host F2F meeting in September.
- John: No word yet from OASIS on when our Wiki will be available.
- Subgroup Reports:
  - Prasad: editor list is catching up on the issues, in two weeks we'll reduce it to half.
- Issues Discussion:
  - Issue 157:
    - John: draft proposal from Alex and Charlton.
    - Charlton: we have a formalized proposal after talking to members of the group. It should be straightforward for people to follow. The proposal is attempting to address all the issues that were raised since issue 157 was opened. Whether copy should be schema aware, what is the actual replace semantics, what information sets does copy deal with, the to/from behavior for initialize variables, the behavior when the destination is not initialized, how info sets must or must not be consistent. there are several proposed changes to 9.3 assignments where we deal with sequence of CII. we add 'replaceElementName', still waiting for comments on this element. Insert section for results of copy operation to define TII and the spec of copy operation. We made a number of updates to support message to variable and variable to message copy semantics. We added sections that detail with replace copy operation and define the latest replacement table for data items. We defined how to handle namespaces and namespaces preservation context.
    - Charlton: it's quite a bit of information to digest in a night, so we need a little more time for people to read through it before we come to a vote.
    - Yaron: I brought up the issue of message to message copy where it appears we are trying to have some schema validation which implies they are compatible. Rather than validating we should allow copying from anything to anything and just call validate.
    - Alex: if we don't know the schema type at analysis time or run time, we allow it to happen. If we the schema type is known, then the implementation can opt to do type checking. If the implementation can deduce the schema type than it may perform type testing and reject assignments that are not compatible, e.g. copying from a shipping address to a line item.

- Yaron: If we follow this path, we break portability. BPEL may run on one system that is very loose on typing we had a vote for that issue and one of the crux of that vote we decided we don't want to end in a situation where one BPEL processor is very loose and the other is strict and will not run the same process, and we lose portability. We need to give people specific expectations of what happens when the process is deployed on a system. I am fine if we have a switch, e.g. allow people to specify they don't want validation anywhere, but with the current proposal we have chaos, you can never know what happens to your process. The value may go from legal to being illegal back to being legal, where in one system there is not checks and its fine, and another system rejects it. We should have a way for people to do validation when they want to and absolutely allow people to do validation on message variables. We cannot allow two systems following the same spec to come to different conclusions whether the process can be allowed or not. If static checking (especially run time checking) is inconsistent, you run into three cases, black, white and gray. The majority of cases are gray (can't know ahead of time), and people can't agree about them. if we don't design our control system very carefully we're going to run into this problem.
- Alex: When we discussed at the F2F we talked about handling this at static analysis. That was part of our working context. In the last F2F we also discussed what happens when an XPath references an element or attribute that doesn't exist, and catching that, was also part of our working context.
- Rania: I think it's fine if we remove the type validation constraint, as Yaron says.
- Yaron: Copy is one of the primary places where validation takes place and where we should resolve how validation is handled, and 157 should provide the text and resolve this issue. If Issue 157 doesn't want to deal with it, we need to carve 157 up and resolve the validation issue first. You can't vote on 157 without understanding our position on validation; only for WSDL messages, we already voted on other types.
- Charlton: The language in the proposal leaves enough flexibility for us to have a conceptual framework on how we wish to validate. Alex did ask if you have additional input on that language to separate it from issue 103. I think we have enough that we can receive input on that language to go ahead with 157 and leave 153 to resolve on a later date.

- Yaron: Alex's proposal had explicit prohibition on copying WSDL messages to WSDL messages, which is a resolution on this subject. Now we're sort of backing away on this issue. I think we need to address this in a richer framework, even if it's just trying to define copy.
- Alex: We passed 160 adding validate attribute/activity, the motivation was to catch all the grey area places. We did not set expectation that you can copy line item to variable of type address; those are black cases that we want to prohibit. If we allow those black cases to exist then people will need to do explicit run-time validation all the time.
- Monica: Many of the questions Yaron raised were answered by Alex, and some changes will go back to the proposal. Given that we only have 30 minutes, perhaps we should address other parts of 157 and deal with these issues later on.
- Charlton: We did receive feedback from Yaron and incorporated into the proposal.
- Yaron: Issue 160 identifies two places where validation is useful: messages and copy. We state the default is validate=no. The default is that even black cases are not caught, The proposal I read (not from last night) had explicit prohibition on copying two message variables that are not identical, and now if someone is violating the black case can find themselves in situation where some people are allowing violation and some people are not. We can't even define exactly what all the black cases are. XML schema in spite of the name is not a real schema language, and can't deal with the black cases in a consistent way. As far as static type checking we should throw a switch, you turn the switch if you agree with the consequences.
- Alex: In the latest proposal there is not a drastic change. The main direction is the same, but we do incorporate three changes from Yaron. I spoke to him in detail and appreciate these changes. Those don't include any message to message variable checks. We are not mandating static type checking in the proposal, but we mandate that if people use XPath 1.0 there is no runtime type checking for portability. 160 talks about run-time validation, not static analysis. I also agree with Yaron that XML Schema is sort of like a type system but has a lot of grey areas. and 157 covers only the black area situations, and if people identify the black area situations they are able to do checking. I'm happy to see a solution that will address portability, but this is the context we agreed about at the last F2F meeting.

- Charlton: In continuation of what Alex is saying, due to lack of mandatory type checking I'm not seeing any inconsistency here. We changed the language to clear that we do not have mandatory type checking at all when using XPath 1.0. If you still have concerns about the language we're open to recommendation.
  - Yaron: The old language is identical to the new language. When copying both variables must have the same message type. This is a static type checking requirement. You cannot copy two WSDL messages unless they have exactly the same qualified type name, so 157 mandates type checking which overrides any of the switches we will have. The change I want to see is that this language is struck from the proposal.
  - Alex: I want to separate schema type checking and message type checking. Issue 157 maintains the status quo of BPEL 1.1 that has WSDL type checking. Should we allow copy from PO message variable type to shipping address message variable type and ask people to check it with explicit validation? I understand the motivation of Yaron but not sure this is something overall as a group we want to do.
  - Chris: Since we only allow access to data to the message at the part level, the treatment would be to copy one set of parts from one container to another, there's no way to do mapping based on like-part.
  - Yaron: Alex is quite correct that even with the restriction you can get around it with individual copies of each of the parts. Today in Issue 160 text we state there is no requirement for validation of incoming messages, that's a configuration that happens outside of BPEL. It's perfectly valid to receive a message that is in fact invalid, has garbled parts, etc. so now we have inconsistency. You can receive an invalid message but you're not allowed to create one through copy. I think it's important we are consistent in how we do schema validation and WSDL validation.
  - Chris: My question is, if you're just moving a set of parts and not doing type checking, then the part names would be in the variable you are copying to.
  - Yaron: That gets especially difficult with Issue 12. Issue 12 explicitly allows you to ignore the part name.
  - John: I've allowed us to go over the 30 minute mark because we've got a shorter call today. We're out of time for the call and will end now. Please review the message that Charlton sent out for Issue 157 and be prepared to discuss and vote on it next week.
- Meeting adjourned at 9:10 AM PT

Action Items:

- All: Review Charlton's email and recap of Issue 157 at <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsbpel/email/archives/200508/msg00011.html>
  - Note: Since the attachments get stripped off in the archives I have uploaded the attachments to [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/13956/WS-BPEL\\_Issue\\_157\\_Proposal.doc](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/13956/WS-BPEL_Issue_157_Proposal.doc) and [http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/13957/WS-BPEL\\_Issue\\_157\\_Proposal\\_with\\_changelog.doc](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/13957/WS-BPEL_Issue_157_Proposal_with_changelog.doc)