FINAL

SCA-Policy TC Teleconference

18 Feb 2008

Chair

Dave Booz, Ashok Malhotra

Scribe

Mike Edwards

Attendees

Name	Company	Status
fred carter	AmberPoint	Group Member
Tom Rutt	Fujitsu Limited*	Group Member
Robert Freund	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
Eisaku Nishiyama	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
Eric Wells	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
David Booz	IBM	Group Member
Mike Edwards	IBM	Group Member
Meeraj Kunnumpurath	Individual	Group Member
Martin Chapman	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Anish Karmarkar	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Rich Levinson	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Ashok Malhotra	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Kaanu Joshi	Patni Computer Systems Ltd.	Group Member
Vladislav Bezrukov	SAP AG*	Group Member
Sanjay Patil	SAP AG*	Group Member
Fabian Ritzmann	Sun Microsystems	Group Member
Pundalik Kudapkar	TIBCO Software Inc.	Group Member

Contents

Resolutions

Resolution: **1. Minutes of 11th February accepted without change**

Resolution: **2. Update the proposal for Issue 24 made by Ashok in the email, to require a default qualifier and to add the modification for section 4.10 described in message #16.**

Actions

Action 20080218-01: Ashok to modify the proposal for Issue 24 and publish to the email list.

Agenda

1. Roll call

2. Appointment of minute taker Mike Edwards

3. Agenda bashing

4. Vote to accept minutes from previous meeting
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00018.html

5. ACTION ITEMS
a. 20071126-01: Editors produce Committee Draft - in progress
b. 20071210-01: Chairs to contribute Transaction spec errata
c. 20071210-02: Chairs to contribute Open transaction issues
d. 20080107-01: Fold transaction spec into policy spec as appendix
e. 20080211-01: Rich and Ashok to build proposal for Issue 26
f. 20080211-02: Ashok to prepare update for issue 24

g. 20080211-03: Michael R to prepare revised wording for section 4.10 for issue 24
DONE: http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00024.html

6. New Issues:
None

7. Issues
a. ISSUE 15: External Attachment of Policy
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-15
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00023.html
the document is in this email:
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00012.html

b. Issue 38: Overrides in the SCA implementation hierarchy
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00029.html
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200801/msg00019.html
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-38

c. ISSUE 24: More direct, structural qualifier definition
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-24
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00021.html
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00016.html
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00007.html
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00004.html

d. ISSUE 26: Schema validateable authorization policy
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-26
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00005.html

e. Issue 42: Infoset for policySet/@appliesTo
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200712/msg00038.html
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-42

f. Issue 43: Use of intents from component type in policySet algorithm
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-43

8. AOB

(Item 3) Agenda Bashing

Ashok - how much can we do without Michael Rowley on the call?
- Only Issues 38, 24 can be discussed today

(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC

Minutes from 11th February 2008.

(Item 5) Action Items

a. 20071126-01: Editors produce Committee Draft - in progress
Done – now complete.

b. 20071210-01: Chairs to contribute Transaction spec errata
c. 20071210-02: Chairs to contribute Open transaction issues
d. 20080107-01: Fold transaction spec into policy spec as appendix
e. 20080211-01: Rich and Ashok to build proposal for Issue 26
f. 20080211-02: Ashok to prepare update for issue 24
Done – update completed.

g. 20080211-03: Michael R to prepare revised wording for section 4.10 for issue 24
Done, wording has been submitted:
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00024.html

(Item 6) New Issues

None

(Item 7) Existing Issues

ISSUE 24: More direct, structural qualifier definition

http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-24
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00021.html
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00016.html
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00007.html
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00004.html

Ashok describes the email exchanges that have taken place
Ashok: the item still to resolve is whether for every intent definition you are REQUIRED to supply a default or whether it is optional. Proposal is to change the proposal to REQUIRE the identification of a default qualifier.

Ashok moves to amend the wording for the proposal for Issue 24 and make the default REQUIRED, fix the schema to reflect this and add Michael Rowley's modification to section 4.10 as described in message #16 from the archive.

Mike Edwards seconds
Accepted unanimously

**Action 20080218-01: Ashok to modify the proposal for Issue 24 and
publish to the email list.**

ISSUE 38: Overrides in the SCA implementation hierarchy

http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-38
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200802/msg00029.html
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200801/msg00019.html

Mike E: Outlines the proposal material
A modification for rule #3: Rule 3: For a composite used as an implementation by a
higher-level component, if the higher level component applies implementation intents to
the composite, those intents act as if they are attached to the <composite/> element. If
any of the intents are mutually exclusive with the intents on the composite element, they
are ignored. The remaining intents on the composite element are applied to components
contained within the composite as defined by Rule 1 for the structural hierarchy.

Sanjay - Not comfortable with Rule 3, which in effect provides a means of "external
attachment" of intents**.** It can lead to imposing intents never envisaged by the developer
- Allowing intents to be expressed in this way does not sound correct

Ashok - my question is a bit different. If you add implementation intents at the higher
level, what do you do with them? Do you throw them away?

<Discussion of usescases for intents to be attached within a composition, rather than
within each implementation>

Mike E: It would be useful to have some examples where there is a problem caused by
the application of an implementation intent at the higher level composite which then
affects the operation of components in the lower level composite

Discussion ended because of lack of time.

AOB
None.

Next meeting 25th Februrary 2008
Close of Business