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Resolutions
None

Actions
ACTION 20080722-01: Mike to raise an issue to require the addition of a new section to the
testcases document describing the requirements that the Assembly testsuite has on *ANY*
implementation language (what artifacts are required and how they must work).
ACTION 20080722-02: Mike to raise this idea of using the OpenCSA member section as the
arbiter of conformance at the main Assembly TC

Agenda
1. Roll Call
2. Appointment of scribe
3. Agenda bashing
4. Minutes from Previous Meeting
5. Action items
Action 20090708-01: Raise an issue to bring the Test Assertions document up to the
Rev2 level of the assembly spec - Eric.
Done
6. Consideration of Status and next steps
Public Review materials are still not posted.
7. Adjourn

(Item 3) Agenda Bashing
No changes

(Item 4) Minutes from Previous Meeting
Minutes for meeting of 8th July are accepted without change.
(Item 5) Action Items
Action 20090708-01: Raise an issue to bring the Test Assertions document up to the Rev2 level of the assembly spec - Eric.

Done

(Item 6) Consideration of status and next steps

Ashok: Worth copying Martin Chapman if you send a chaser email to Mary about the public review

Mike: So what do we think the next "real" steps should be?
Mike: Should we consider doing the work behind that upgrade to the Test Assertions document?
Ashok: How much work is it going to be
Mike; I don't know - "how long is a piece of string" question

Bryan: How is the repository organized now? You did a branch of the Public Review version, right? Also, what about that question of which TCs own the implementation artifacts in the test suite? - we have 4 sets already: Java, CPP, C, BPEL
Bryan: Do we split the testcase document into pieces - eg a Core document and then separate documents for each implementation specific set of artifacts?

Ashok: We should separate the SCDL material...look at the Assembly tests - some of them only involve the SCDL, like the ones that check QNames, for example
- those are "language independent". They should be separated out.
Then the language + SCDL stuff can be handled separately.

Mike: The testcases aren't structured like that - all testcases are "live" in that they all have real implementations and they can't work without them.
Ashok: You can use "dummy" implementations - a basic skeleton form
Mike: That is what we really have:
package org.oasisopen.sca.test;

import org.oasisopen.sca.annotation.Remotable;

/**
 * A test service interface
 * @author MikeEdwards
 */
@Remotable
public interface Service1 {

/**
 * Method for invoking testcase service
 * @param input - input parameter(s) as a String
 * @return - output data as a String
 */
public String operation1( String input );
}
package org.oasisopen.sca.test;

import org.oasisopen.sca.annotation.*;
import org.oasisopen.sca.test.Service1;

/**
 * Java component implementation
 * 1 service with interface Service1
 * 0 references
 *
 * @author MikeEdwards
 */

@Service(Service1.class)
public class service1Impl implements Service1 {

@property
public String serviceName = "service1";

public String operation1(String input) {
    return serviceName + " operation1 invoked";
}
}

Eric: What has an implementation got to do as far an implementation is concerned? Could we define an "implementation.test" which is purely used to test the Assembly part?
- this might help us solve things.

Mike: How would implementation.test be defined?
Eric: There would be a test language TC to handle its definition...
Eric: What would that language need to do?
Ashok: It would need to produce a complete SC DL, that's all.
Bryan: You could do SOME of the tests that way, ones which are static tests of SC DL files.
Ashok: That is what I am advocating - separate out those static tests.
Bryan: But there are other testcases that require actual execution.
Eric: The requirements are not such as to require a complete full-blown implementation type.
- not sure what this would buy us, other than to get us away from dependence on specific implementation language
- which does cause a problem
- could just be another can of worms

Mike: I built the tests using the assumption that an SCA runtime MUST implement an implementation language

Ashok: That will require us to state in the document what is required for each implementation type

Mike: Yes, I agree - I basically agreed to that idea in my email exchanges with Jim

**ACTION 20080722-01: Mike to raise an issue to require the addition of a new section to the testcases document describing the requirements that the Assembly testsuite has on *ANY* implementation language (what artifacts are required and how they must work).**

<Discussion of the question of openness and conformance>
Bryan: We may need to consult with someone like Jamie Clark, who is a lawyer, about the legal aspects of this.
Mike: Maybe this is a OpenCSA member section discussion - let them work this one out

**ACTION 20080722-02: Mike to raise this idea of using the OpenCSA member section as the arbiter of conformance at the main Assembly TC**

Mike: Currently, for BPEL for example, has 53 language artifacts, of which 23 are composite files (with implementation.bpel), BPEL files, WSDL interfaces (with BPEL partnerLink extensions) Doing another language means creating those 53 artifacts in the new language
Bryan Aupperle: And for what it is worth, 93 for C++ and 70 for C.

**AOB**

Next meeting 29 July.

Close of Business