

PWG WIMS

Conference Call

November 30, 2005

Harry Lewis - PWG Chairman; WIMS w/g Secretary
11/30/2005

Attendees

Harry Lewis	IBM
Ira McDonald	High North
Bill Wagner	Bill Wagner
Pete Zehler	Xerox

General Discussion

Accepted previous minutes.

WIMS Protocol

WIMS protocol Remote Fleet Management diagram updates. Change diagram to more accurately represent commands and return messages. Supplement with a numbered annotation of the steps. Add 2nd example of internal enterprise originated mgt. Ira supplied such a diagram in plain text. Needs to be redrawn in graphic form. Ira Nov 17 message recommendations accepted.

We would like to complete the WIMS diagram updates before we go to PWG Last Call but this is not absolutely necessary. We can enter PWG last call with known w/g last call comments which are uncontroversial. Get into PWG Last Call before Christmas to make Jan 19th target (f2f). Aim for week of Dec 14th.

WSDL versions and SOAP examples

Discussion about WSDL v2.0 vs v1.1. WSDL v1.1 is a W3C note and not on standards track. We chose WSDL 2.0 expecting that it would be completed and formally approved by now. Can we wait until Mid 2006? What are the alternatives? Don't specify WSDL at all (other than by examples of SOAP 1.2 and 1.1 in separate spec).

Although many people are doing it, there are no “official” guidelines for how to kludge SOAP 1.2 into WSDL 1.1. Different tools do the job differently, with different results.

If we use WSDL 1.1 it will generate SOAP requests for us (however).

At our last meeting, we agreed to reduce WIMS to an abstract protocol that conveys the messages appropriate to WIMS. We originally wanted a wire protocol (however) so we eventually need some binding(s). It seems one normative binding may be necessary to assure interoperability and spawn adoption. At this meeting we reiterated the need for 2 separate documents (the abstract spec and the binding examples). The abstract spec may need to refer to named bindings in URI section. The binding doc(s) will include (or reference) WSDL 2.0 (and 1.1 for compatibility) bindings.

Do we need an exceptions section to document what can go wrong with an operation? Would increase size of spec. As an alternative, we can add a paragraph referring to status strings from IPP spec. The complete set of Client and Server errors are already documented in IPP. This is better reuse of the Common Semantic Model. If we do encounter an error code specific to WIMS we'll add it (like PSI did) but, right now, we haven't identified any.

Ira did generate WSDL 2.0 manually and found it did not result in as much WSDL as originally anticipated. We could benefit from a tool that reads WSDL 2.0. Harry will try to find a prototype tool inside IBM and use it to read Ira's handwritten WSDL 2.0 and generate SOAP messages or at least capture the error log.

RelaxNG

RelaxNG. Use in addition to XML Schema? Better language, more readable. Context free grammar (however). Need smarter processors to consume it. There are RelaxNG validation tools. Most new W3C spec(s) have informative XML schema and normative RelaxNG schema. This is more a SC issue. From a WIMS point of view XML Schema are adequate. RelaxNG might be desirable for future compatibility and should be a SC topic.

Next Conference Call

Wednesday, 12-7-2005
Noon Eastern (NYC)

Toll Free: 1-866-365-4406
International: 00+1+303-248-9655
Passcode: 2635888#