ATTENDEES:
- Peter Furniss
- Yaron Golan
- Monica Martin
- John Evdemon

REGrets:
- Diane Jordan
- Harvey Reed

MISSING:
- Randall Anderson
- Assaf Arkin
- Sid Askary
- David Burdett
- Ryan Cairns
- Martin Chapman
- Jamie Clark
- Ram Jeyaraman
- Edwin Khodabakchian
- Yanming Li
- Balinder Malhi
- Jeff Mischkinsky
- Greg Ritzinger
- Dieter Roller
- Howard Smith
- Gloria Vargas
- Ganesh Vednere
- Prasad Yendluri

AGENDA/MINUTES:
- Call began at 11:05 AM ET (we started late to accommodate people calling in late).
- John volunteered to take minutes.
- Objective of the call was to discuss current issues and identify Issues for discussion on next week’s TC call.
- Issue 3:
  - Satish sent out a proposal on 10/12, which did not give us time to review before the TC call
  - This issue will be voted on at the next TC
Issue 36:
- Although this issue was voted on, an example is still needed.
- Assaf Arkin apparently volunteered to pull together an example to illustrate this issue.

Yaron expressed concern about the spec being unclear on multi-start activities.
- Yaron believes that this is a potential issue - the editorial direction on this topic is not clear.

Yaron is planning to submit a new issue: Use of “initiate” attribute on a correlation set when creating a process instance in a multi-start activity may be harmful. We should avoid or clarify how to use “initiate” as an attribute on correlation sets for multi-start activities.
- Yaron believes this is redundant, but it makes the code more readable (this is an aesthetic issue, not a technical fault)
- Scenario: multiple start activities
  - The “initiate” attribute only occurs on correlation sets
  - Correlation sets can be initiated once and only once
  - “initiate=yes” is required on correlation sets for multi-start activities
  - The first multi-start activity fires and initiates a correlation set
  - The second multi-start activity fires – this causes an error due to the previous initiation of the correlation set

The following issues will be discussed on next week’s TC conference call:
- Issue 72 is ready for voting
  - This issue is ready to be voted upon if a proposal is posted by 10/21.
- Issue 2
  - This issue is not yet ready for a vote.
  - This is an important issue that may impact (or possibly negate) several other issues.
- Issue 3
  - This issue is ready to be voted upon.
  - Satish proposed a resolution to this issue on 10/12 (see http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/wsbpel/200310/msg00124.html). The proposed resolution was not raised in time to vote on it in the 10/15 TC conf call. (The Issue Process requires at least one week to review the proposed resolution.)
- Issue 4
  - This issue is not yet ready for a vote.
- Issue 5
  - This issue is not yet ready for a vote.
  - If we define a suspend feature, what happens to existing flows (threads)?
  - Monica thought that there could be a time requirement until the outstanding threads can all be killed.
Peter thought this should be an implementation feature and not something that should be part of the actual spec. John and Yaron agreed.

Monica believes the Use Case group could take a closer look at this and possibly identify (business) patterns that may require this capability.

Yaron indicated that the description of this issue should be changed to point to Use Cases.

- Call ended at 11:47 AM ET.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

1) Peter will review the comments for Issue 72 and write up a proposed resolution by 10/21 COB. This will enable the TC to vote on this issue at the next conf call.

2) Diane and John will add Issues 72, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to the agenda for the next TC conf call.

3) Yaron plans to write up an issue that encompasses the following:
   - The current language on multi-start must be clarified in the spec
   - Use of "initiate" attribute on a correlation set when creating a process instance in a multi-start activity
   - Should the "initiate" attribute be required on correlation sets? Can we use a special setting for multi-starts?

4) Monica will submit Issue 5 for consideration to the Use Case subgroup. The Use Case subgroup could consider Issue 5 for a “bottom up” scenario (a technical issue that is mapped up into a real-world business issue).

5) John will follow-up with Assaf to discuss an example for Issue 36.