

WS-Calendar Platform Independent Model (PIM) since CSPRD02

[OASIS Technical Committees Issue Tracker](#)

Displaying 31 issues at 15/Aug/14 4:35 PM.

Issue Type	Key	Summary	Reporter	Environment	Priority	Status	Resolution	Description	Resolution
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-537</a>	WS-Calendar generally uses lowerCamel for names. Use it consistently	Toby Considine	Toby Considine	Minor	Closed	Fixed	The attributes of ToleranceType are NOT in lowerCamelCase (e.g. startBefore should be startBefore).	Use lowerCamelCase for attribute names in ToleranceType, for example durationLong, durationShort, precision (no change), ... startBefore.  Apply consistently to all attributes in the model.
Sub-task	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-536</a>	WSCALENDAR-505 Correct OASIS Reference format in PIM	William Cox	Chet Ensign	Minor	Closed	Fixed		Correct to include Editors where it makes sense - Energy Interoperation and WS-Calendar.  Some non-normative references have many editors; no change for them.
Sub-task	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-535</a>	WSCALENDAR-532 Compare and contrast TimeRangeType and AvailabilityIntervalType	William Cox	William Cox	Major	Closed	Fixed	TimeRangeType and AvailabilityIntervalType look similar but have different semantics.  TimeRangeType (see WSCALENDAR-533 ) is partially bound, consistent with InternetDraft05.  AvailabilityIntervalType (called that to avoid unintentional though scoped differences with respect to IntervalType in the PIM package) is fully bound, having both dtStart and duration.	Insert a sentence at end of Section 4.7 contrasting TimeRangeType and AvailabilityIntervalType.  Consider an example in the separate PIM Examples Committee Note (in progress)
Sub-task	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-534</a>	WSCALENDAR-532 Delete FreeBusy type and associated classes	William Cox	William Cox	Major	Closed	Fixed	FreeBusy and its associated types are planned by CalConnect/IETF to be replaced with Vavailability. Delete all references to this obsolescent approach.  While current implementations use FreeBusy, the applications are restricted and not particularly useful.	Delete Free and Busy Status section.  Mention FreeBusy in a footnote in Availability section 4.7  Delete FreeBusy and related classes from the UML model.
Sub-task	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-533</a>	WSCALENDAR-532 Describe the semantics of Vavailability and Availability	William Cox	William Cox	Major	Closed	Fixed		Include text (taken from the model notes edited):  The Vavailability class includes a partially specified interval in which all blocks of granularity size are busy per the busy attribute - BUSY, BUY-UNAVAILABLE, BUSY-TENTATIVE.  The timeRange is "busy" for the purposes of a specific use. The class TimeRangeType MAY have a start time (optional), and if a start time is present MAY contain a duration (optional). It can accordingly apply to (1) all time (no dtStart, no duration) (2) a half-infinite interval (dtStart, no duration) (3) a bound interval (dtStart, duration)  The optional granularity that MAY be present describes the time blocks used for expressing Availability—for example, for one hour blocks, use P1H.  Against this backdrop, The associate AvailabilityType objects indicate available times with an AvailabilityIntervalType having dtStart, duration, and optional tz.
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-532</a>	Vavailability is not fully synchronized with Vavailability Internet Draft 05	William Cox	William Cox	Major	Closed	Fixed	See sub-tasks.  Time range for Vavailability is implicitly defined in ID05 and in WS-Calendar 1.0, but must be explicit in the PIM. The constraints differ from a fully bound interval, and the semantics must be described in the PIM.  Add text describing the overview of Availability, the semantics of Time Range, and of Availability Intervals.	Add text describing the overview of Availability, the semantics of Time Range, and of Availability Intervals.

Sub-task	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-531</a>	WSCALENDAR-526 Eliminate the UnsignedDurationType, leaving DurationType, and clarify conformance	William Cox	William Cox	Major	Closed	Fixed	<p>Eliminate signed/unsigned duration distinction: Delete UnsignedDurationType, and keep only DurationType.</p> <p>Ensure that Gap and Tolerance type conformance is right (for Tolerance 8601 unsigned as conformed; for Gap add optional sign to 8601 in the style of RFC5545.</p> <p>Tie in with discussion on the restrictions in XSD and iCalendar</p>	<p>Delete UnsignedDurationType from WD11.</p> <p>Clarify conformance and sources for DurationType, and conformance that differs in ToleranceType.</p> <p>Consider simply ignoring sign in Tolerance - conformed strings are easier.</p>
Sub-task	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-530</a>	WSCALENDAR-526 ToleranceType needs clarification of Duration use and conformance	William Cox	William Cox	Major	Closed	Fixed	<p>ToleranceType needs clarification of Duration use. From the model notes on class ToleranceType for consideration and coordinated correction:</p> <p>"A tolerance value is a set of durations which indicate the allowed tolerance for the indicated value, e.g. startafter=PT5M indicates that 5 minutes late is acceptable, and startbefore=PT10M indicates that 10 minutes prior is acceptable.</p> <p>There may be many tolerance attributes associated with a given DurationType object. Care should be taken in implementations to avoid confusing combinations, as the semantics may be complex.</p> <p>If no Tolerance values are associated, applications SHOULD use cardinality 0 for IntervalType::tolerance."</p>	<p>Correct and coordinate Notes in the model with specification text and conformance as needed.</p>
Sub-task	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-529</a>	WSCALENDAR-526 RelationLinkType::gap: DurationType must have correct, signed, duration	William Cox	William Cox	Major	Closed	Fixed	<p>The note in the WD12 UML model says</p> <p>"DurationType for gap SHALL include an optional sign.</p> <p>A negative gap indicates that the referenced target starts before the referencing Interval. A non-negative (or unsigned) gap indicates that the referenced target starts at the same time (zero gap) or after the referencing Interval."</p> <p>Ensure that these semantics are included in the specification.</p>	<p>Include gap:DurationType semantics as described.</p> <p>Include clarification of the nature of Duration, and the specific places where negative sign duration may be present, and behavior when a signed Duration appears and unsigned is required.</p>
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-528</a>	Model notes must appear in the specification	William Cox	William Cox	Major	Closed	Fixed	<p>Some conformance statements are in the Notes to classes and attributes in the UML Model.</p> <p>Verify that all necessary conformance appears at least in the specification.</p> <p>It is desirable but not necessary that conformance and references appear in both the model and the specification.</p>	<p>Ensure that conformance statements are in the narrative and/or the conformance section of the specification.</p>
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-527</a>	Eliminate XML Schema Type Package from UML Model	William Cox	William Cox	Minor	Closed	Fixed	<p>There is much in the specification about the differences between XSD types, iCalendar types, and the UML primitive type String.</p> <p>The exposition is confused because the model has the Enterprise Architect XSDDatatypes package included, although it appears to not be used.</p> <p>WD11 changed all instances of "string" (referencing XSDTypes) to "String" (referencing the UML primitive type).</p>	<p>Remove the XSDDatatypes package from the model.</p> <p>Ensure that UML stereotypes related to XML Schema are deleted from the model, and any references to the deleted package are corrected.</p>
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-526</a>	ISO 8601 conformance, reference, and attribute naming	William Cox	William Cox	Major	Closed	Fixed	<p>Remove "ISO8601" from the attribute names for DurationType and DateTimeType.</p> <p>Clarify conformance and reference: RFC5545/RFC6321 allows an optional sign on Duration, ISO8601 does not.</p> <p>Understand that "notes" for conformance in the UML model must also be reflected in the specification.</p>	<p>Change the attributes to eliminate ISO8601.</p> <p>Insert text related to signed (ONLY for gap, IGNORED if present for Tolerance and IntervalType::duration)</p>

Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-525</a>	Enterprise Architect 11 supports XMI 2.4.1; text says that tooling does not	William Cox	William Cox	Minor	Closed	No Action	Text in WD11 says that tooling supports XMI 2.1. I just found capability in Enterprise Architect to export in XMI 2.4.1 form, but have validated neither round trip (import/export) nor support in previous versions.  This is minor issue, and does not need to be corrected; the substantial work to verify is not worth it since every tool tested supports XMI 2.1.	No action. Not all TC members have upgraded to Enterprise Architect 11.
Improvement	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-524</a>	Unclear, out-of-scope statement in Conformance section	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Minor	Closed	Fixed	Unclear, out-of-scope statement in Conformance section 9 [Line 621]  The sentence "If the implementer and/or implementation claiming conformance is using WS-Calendar PIM as part of a larger business or service communication, they SHALL follow not only the semantic rules herein, but SHALL also conform to the rules for specifying inheritance in referencing standards."  Such concerns on how implementations should claim conformance to something larger than this specification, seems out of place/scope. Why the worry?  A bit confusing, because that seems to open the door to the referencing standard/profile altering the conditions for conformance to THIS (WS-cal PIM) specification	Address the concerns expressed. Part of rewrite of entire Conformance section 9.
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-523</a>	It is not clear what are the conformance targets and the conformance requirements are not clearly assigned to these.	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Major	Closed	Fixed	It is not clear what are the conformance targets and the conformance requirements are not clearly assigned to these. [Applies to section 9 line 621]  The conformance rules/clauses should more explicitly refer to a notion of implementation. What is supposed to conform? When reading the beginning of 9.2 [line 630] and in 9.2.1, one understands that "specifications" are conformance targets of interest.  But then, in 9.2.5 [line 703] and 9.2.6, new conformance targets appear such as Intervals, Bounded Intervals, Sequences (and Services?) .  Aren't such elements just parts of a "specification"? is there a need to distinguish them as separate, standalone conformance targets?  Is it expected that Intervals or Sequences will claim separately conformance to WS-Calendar?  9.2.6 seems to also address "Specifications" in spite of its title.  To make all this clearer it would be better to clearly list all the possible types of conformance targets at the beginning of the conformance section - then for each, to make a separate conformance clause. (with the understanding that it makes sense to claim conformance separately for each) But also, several conformance requirements e.g. in 9.2.6 read more like normative requirements that belong to the body of the specification. Any reason to have them in the conformance section	Add note that this is a Platform-Independent Model, and these are requirements on MODELS claiming conformance, including but not limited to Platform-Specific Models.  Per other items, split Section 9 into a Rules Section and a Conformance Section.
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-522</a>	Unclear conformance requirements in section 9.2.3 "Conformance issues"	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Major	Closed	Fixed	Unclear conformance requirements in section 9.2.3 "Conformance issues" [line 677]  For "Precision" bullet point [line 682]: reads more like a recommendation that probably belongs best in the body of the specification ( also, missing question mark).  For "Time Zones and UTC" [line 684] : it is unclear how these details "restrict the variability inherent in the expressions of Date and Time ": there are several "may" statements normative requirements, and one "cannot". It would be clearer if normative keywords were used (MAY, MAY NOT). Even so, such optional keywords are difficult to interpret in a conformance clause: they sound more like "relaxation" than restrictions - (and a conformance clause is not supposed to relax normative requirements) as stated in the body.	Consider placement and wording of Section 9.2.3 and entire Conformance section. Split section 9 into a Rules Section and a Conformance Section.  Add note that these are requirements on conforming specifications, and that they indicate documentation as well as behavior requirements. Clarify 9.2.3 as documentation requirement on specifications claiming conformance.  Clarify wording for elements of the referenced bullet list [PIM WD12]  Reference: WSCALENDAR-521

Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-521</a>	Inheritance behavior out of place in Conformance section	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Major	Closed	Fixed	In section 9.2.1 [line 647], there are rules for inheritance that - apparently - represent normative content that should be part of the body of the specification, and not introduced in the Conformance section (the latter should only be concerned with referring to prior content, or might state new requirements but only if they are not appropriate in the spec body.) Any reason why these inheritance rules could not belong to the specification narrative?	Restructure document so the rules applied are in a separate section prior to and not included in the Conformance section.  Write appropriate conformance clauses to reference those rules.
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-520</a>	HTML Redirect	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Trivial	Closed	No Action	The W3C link checker reports: ***** Lines: 845, 854 <a href="http://www.unc.edu/">http://www.unc.edu/</a> redirected to <a href="http://unc.edu/">http://unc.edu/</a> Status: 301 -> 200 OK This is a permanent redirect. The link should be updated. ***** Otherwise the draft is clean! Congratulations!	No change. The resolved link is wherever the domain owner chooses, and the <a href="http://www.unc.edu/">www.unc.edu</a> reference works. Checked with UNC administrative staff, and they recommend leaving reference as it is.
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-519</a>	Normative vs. Non-Normative text	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Major	Closed	Fixed	1. Introduction reads: ***** All text is normative unless otherwise labeled. ***** Is there any non-normative text before Section 5, which is labeled as non-normative? I ask because Section 4 (just an example, not the only one) begins: ***** In this section we introduce the PIM, and treat in turn each component of the PIM. Each subsection has an introduction, a diagram, and discussion that may include the relationship of the respective components to the rest of the PIM. This Platform-Independent Model (PIM) [MDA] describes an abstraction from which the Platform-Specific Model (PSM) of [WS-Calendar] can be derived. The intent is twofold: (1) To define an abstraction for calendar and schedule more in the style of web services descriptions, which may be used directly, and (2) To define the PIM as a model allowing easy transformation or adaptation between systems using the family of WS-Calendar specifications (such as [WS-Calendar], [xCal], [iCalendar]) as well as those addressing concepts of time intervals and Sequences (such as [IEC CIM], [EnergyInteroperation], and [EMIX]). ***** I don't experience that portion of section 4 as normative text. There are simply introductions and asides that appear to be non-normative.	Review and rewrite the entire specification as necessary to ensure that non-normative text is marked as non-normative.
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-518</a>	Vague list	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Major	Closed	Fixed	2.2 Key Abstractions [line 112] reads as follows: ***** We define the following in order: · Types for date, time, and duration · The Interval · Payload attachment to an Interval · Relations · The Gluon · Tolerance · Availability ***** Actually, no, those are not defined in order. As a matter of fact, this same list appears at 4.1 [line 215] and begins to define these terms at 4.2 [line 247].  Moreover, neither list has section references and/or hyperlinks to the appropriate sections.  [line references inserted]	Add internal cross references to the items on line 215 and reword introductory text.  Delete section 2.2.  Address as part of overall edit for correct description and normative statements.
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-517</a>	Incorrect ISO citation for ISO 8601:2004	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Minor	Closed	Fixed	1.2 Normative References reads in part: ***** [ISO8601] ISO (International Organization for Standardization). Representations of dates and times, third edition, December 2004, (ISO 8601:2004) ***** The correct citation (as given by: <a href="http://www.iso.org/iso/home/search.htm?q=8601%3A2004&amp;sort=rel&amp;type=simple&amp;published=on">http://www.iso.org/iso/home/search.htm?q=8601%3A2004&amp;sort=rel&amp;type=simple&amp;published=on</a> ) is: ***** Data elements and interchange formats -- Information interchange -- Representation of dates and times ***** The traditional key is: ISO 8601:2004.	Change citation to [ISO8601] ISO (International Organization for Standardization). Data elements and interchange formats -- Information interchange -- Representation of dates and times, Edition 3, 3 December 2004, (ISO 8601:2004)
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-516</a>	Four (4) incorrect RFC citations	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Minor	Closed	Fixed	All four (4) of the RFCs in 1.2 Normative References are cited incorrectly. That includes 2219, which is properly cited in the template distributed by the TC admin.  Original proposed resolution: Correct the RFC citations as per the RFC Editor's list at: <a href="http://www.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/rfc-ref.txt">http://www.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/rfc-ref.txt</a> or my only current RFC list at: <a href="http://www.durusau.net/standards/rfc/current/">http://www.durusau.net/standards/rfc/current/</a>	Format to be applied (with the title in Italic) is:  [RFC2119] Bradner, S., Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels, <a href="http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2119.txt">http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2119.txt</a> , BCP 14, IETF RFC 2119, March 1997.  Change all RFC and Internet Draft references to that format for consistency.

Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-515</a>	XMI - incorrect citation	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Minor	Closed	Fixed	1.2 Normative References reads in part : ***** [XMI] XMI Version 2.1, September 2005, Object Management Group, <a href="http://www.omg.org/spec/XMI/2.1/">http://www.omg.org/spec/XMI/2.1/</a> ***** The document in question gives its citation as: ***** MOF 2.0/XMI Mapping Specification, v2.1 ***** Out of six (6) normative references, you have gotten six (6) of those six (6) incorrect.	Correct all citations as identified in this and other items.  Note in updating that the tooling used supports XMI 2.1 but not 2.4.x.  Changes: [XMI] MOF 2.0/XMI Mapping Specification, v2.1, September 2005, Object Management Group, <a href="http://www.omg.org/spec/XMI/2.1/">http://www.omg.org/spec/XMI/2.1/</a>  Footnote reads " The UML tools used by the TC support version 2.1, which is not the most recent as of this date."
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-514</a>	Invalid, incorrect and otherwise flawed Non-Normative References	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Minor	Closed	Fixed	Section 1.3 reads in part: ***** [BPMN] OMG Standards, <a href="http://www.bpmn.org/">http://www.bpmn.org/</a> . [invalid on its face]  *** [IEC CIM] International Electrotechnical Commission, IEC 61968/61970, various dates, <a href="http://www.iec.ch">http://www.iec.ch</a> [Invalid on its face]  *** [XMLSchema] XML Schema, World Wide Web Consortium, <a href="http://www.w3.org/standards/xml/schema">http://www.w3.org/standards/xml/schema</a> [XML Schema exists in two parts, the correct citations being: XMLSCHEMA11-1 W3C XML Schema Definition Language (XSD) 1.1 Part 1: Structures , S. , M. , H. S. Thompson, N. Mendelsohn, D. Beech, M. Maloney, Editors, W3C Recommendation, 5 April 2012, <a href="http://www.w3.org/TR/2012/REC-xmlschema11-1-20120405/">http://www.w3.org/TR/2012/REC-xmlschema11-1-20120405/</a> . Latest version available at <a href="http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlschema11-1/">http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlschema11-1/</a> . XMLSCHEMA11-2 W3C XML Schema Definition Language (XSD) 1.1 Part 2: Datatypes , D. Peterson, S. , A. Malhotra, M. , H. S. Thompson, P. V. Biron, Editors, W3C Recommendation, 5 April 2012, <a href="http://www.w3.org/TR/2012/REC-xmlschema11-2-20120405/">http://www.w3.org/TR/2012/REC-xmlschema11-2-20120405/</a> . Latest version available at <a href="http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlschema11-2/">http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlschema11-2/</a> . ]  ***** I have not proofed the remaining citations under 1.3 Non-Normative references but suggest that the editor verify all the citations before submitting another version of this work product.	Correct URI to <a href="http://www.omg.org/spec/BPMN/2.0/">http://www.omg.org/spec/BPMN/2.0/</a> .  Change BPMN Citation to  [BPMN] Business Process Model and Notation (BPMN) Version 2.0, Object Management Group, Version 2.0, <a href="http://www.omg.org/spec/BPMN/2.0/">http://www.omg.org/spec/BPMN/2.0/</a> , January 2011  Change XMLSchema Citation to  [XMLSchema] W3C XML Schema Definition Language (XSD) 1.1, World Wide Web Consortium, Part 1: Structures, S. Gao, C. M. Sperberg-McQueen, H. S. Thompson, N. Mendelsohn, D. Beech, M. Maloney, Editors, W3C Recommendation, 5 April 2012, <a href="http://www.w3.org/TR/2012/REC-xmlschema11-1-20120405/">http://www.w3.org/TR/2012/REC-xmlschema11-1-20120405/</a> . Latest version available at <a href="http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlschema11-1/">http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlschema11-1/</a> . Part 2: Datatypes, D. Peterson, S. Gao, A. Malhotra, C. M. Sperberg-McQueen, H. S. Thompson, P. Biron, Editors. W3C Recommendation, 5 April 2012, <a href="http://www.w3.org/TR/2012/REC-xmlschema11-2-20120405/">http://www.w3.org/TR/2012/REC-xmlschema11-2-20120405/</a> . Latest version available at <a href="http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlschema11-2/">http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlschema11-2/</a>  IEC-CIM - see comment. The following parts define schedules, and use "StartTime" and ISO 8601 Duration and Time, hence are most relevant: IEC 61970-301, Ed. 5.0 IEC 61968-9, Ed. 1  Change IEC-CIM reference to
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-513</a>	1.5 Naming Conventions - vague	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Major	Closed	Fixed	1.5 Naming Conventions reads in part: ***** [line 65] "Some UML predefined types are used, e.g. string." ***** It would be good to share with the reader which UML predefined types are used along with references to where they are defined in UML. BTW, note that UML is *not* a normative reference in 1.2.	The only UML primitive type used is String from <a href="http://www.omg.org/spec/UML/20110701/PrimitiveTypes.xml">http://www.omg.org/spec/UML/20110701/PrimitiveTypes.xml</a> and footnote the URI for the definition.  Change UML reference to normative.  Include note that the tooling used supports XMI 2.1 as used in the Primitive Types definition.
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-512</a>	Normative text confusion	Toby Considine	TAB Comments. Line 2, 70-72	Major	Closed	Fixed	Section 1 reads: ***** All text is normative unless otherwise labeled. ***** However, that is contradicted by 1.6, which reads in part: ***** All items in the tables not marked as "optional" are mandatory. Information in the "Specification" column of the tables is normative. Information appearing in the "Note" column is explanatory and non-normative. All sections explicitly noted as examples are informational and are not to be considered normative. ***** So information in the Note column, if not labeled as non-normative is normative, except that if it is in the Note column then it is explanatory. Yes? This type of conflict/confusion is unnecessary.	Revise to have one statement in one location of normative versus non-normative; reference line 72 (Section 1.6, Editing Conventions) at line 2 as follows:  All text is normative unless otherwise labeled. Notes and examples are non-normative; see Section 1.6 Editing Conventions.  Combine text as suggested, consistent with OASIS document templates.
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-511</a>	Appendix D is not really about "conformance" differences.	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Minor	Closed	Fixed	Appendix D seems to be mis-titled. It really only compares normative content between specifications - not their conformance requirements (which should only show in a Conformance sections).	Delete Appendix D.

Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-510</a>	SOA-RM Normative?	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Major	Closed	Fixed	1.7 Architectural References and Background reads in part: ***** WS-Calendar and this WS-Calendar PIM assume incorporation into services. Accordingly it assumes a certain background of definitions and discussion of roles, names, and interaction patterns. This document relies heavily on roles and interactions as defined in the OASIS Standard Reference Model for Service Oriented Architecture [SOA-RM]. ***** Does "relies heavily on roles and interactions" [lines 76-77] mean that this proposal normatively relies on SOA-RM? If so, SOA-RM needs to be under normative references and where appropriate, cited by section numbers.	The PIM does not rely on SOA-RM, and has an informative reference to connect the purpose of WS-Calendar to the purpose of the PIM.  Note that this is carryover text from WS-Calendar, included so that the context of WS-Calendar. However, WS-Calendar as a PSM likely has a different focus than the PIM (although the PIM purpose fits well with the stated WS-Calendar purpose on lines 76-77).  Improve the wording and retain the non-normative reference to SOA-RM.
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-509</a>	2 Architecture - Normative?	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Major	Closed	Fixed	Is any part of Section 2 Architecture normative? I see a great deal of discussion of what the proposal is going to do but nothing that makes any normative demands on an implementer of this proposal. Yes?	Change Section 2 to non-normative and integrate content from Section 6 Architectural Basis. The discussion provides context but does not include normative requirements.
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-508</a>	3.1 Time Intervals and (more normative language)	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Major	Closed	Fixed	3.1 Time Intervals and Collections of Time-Related Intervals reads in part: ***** Certain terms appear throughout this document and are defined in Table 3- 1. Some terms are discussed in greater depth in later sections. In all cases, the normative definition is in this section. WS-Calendar terminology begins with a specialized terminology for the segments of time, and for groups of related segments of time. These terms are defined in Table 3- 1 through Table 3- 4 below, and are quoted from [WS-Calendar]. The definitions are normative because this is a standalone specification. ***** The "The definitions are normative because this is a standalone specification." was the first thing that caught my eye. Really? Standalone or not that sentence makes no sense. But then noticing, "certain terms," "some terms," etc. Rather than copying from WS-Calendar, why not make a profile of WS-Calendar that has the six (6) changes listed in Appendix D and then require conformance to WS-Calendar and then this as a profile? A lot less writing and unnecessary UML diagrams.	(1) the PIM semantics must be self-contained (free standing) (2) the relationship of the PIM to WS-Calendar must be the same as any PIM to its respective PSMs (i.e., that to understand the PIM one must not be required to read one specific PSM, which would be a normative reference nightmare) (3) the exposition must be clear to the reader who looks at WS-Calendar and then WS-Calendar PIM (4) the exposition must clearly use UML terminology rather than XSD terminology (this would clean up section 2.5)  Finally, the circularity in normative reference is addressed by changing the normative reference to WS-Calendar 1.0 to informative.
Bug	<a href="#">WSCALENDAR-507</a>	Section 4 Descriptions	Toby Considine	TAB Comments	Major	Closed	Fixed	Section 4.2.1 Model Diagram reads in part: ***** The class · ToleranceValueType is comprised of a set of optional attributes of DurationType. Tolerances can be expressed in any combination; however, the complexity of rules addressing the relationships of tolerances in start, end, and duration will likely lead to implementation-specific rules limiting the concurrent uses of tolerance attributes. ***** It is difficult to tell if this is expressing a normative requirement or is it simply commentary along the way? The majority of section 4 reads this way so take this as a single example.	Revise Section 4 separating normative text from alternatives, applications, and references to WS-Calendar 1.0. A PIM should not normatively reference one of its PSMs.