

DRAFT***SCA-Policy TC Teleconference******12 May 2008******Chair***

Dave Booz, Ashok Malhotra

Scribe

Mike Edwards

Attendees

Name	Company	Status
fred carter	AmberPoint	Group Member
Dale Moberg	Axway Software*	Group Member
Michael Rowley	BEA Systems, Inc.	Group Member
Jacques Durand	Fujitsu Limited*	Group Member
Tom Rutt	Fujitsu Limited*	Group Member
Robert Freund	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
Eric Wells	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
Michael Beisiegel	IBM	Group Member
David Booz	IBM	Group Member
Mike Edwards	IBM	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
Sanjay Patil	SAP AG*	Group Member
Fabian Ritzmann	Sun Microsystems	Group Member
Tai-Hsing Cha	TIBCO Software Inc.	Group Member

Murty Gurajada	TIBCO Software Inc.	Group Member
Pundalik Kudapkar	TIBCO Software Inc.	Group Member

Contents

Resolutions.....	2
Actions	2
Agenda	2
(Item 3) Agenda Bashing	4
(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC	4
(Item 5) F2F Logistics	4
(Item 6) Action Items.....	4
(Item 7) New Issues	5
ISSUE 53: How do we tell what a policySet @provides?	5
ISSUE 54: Wire validation rules have changed.....	5
ISSUE 55: Clarify the handling of intents	5
(Item 8) Existing Issues	6
Issue 43: Use of intents from component type in policySet algorithm.....	6
Issue 15: External Policy Attachement	7
ISSUE 52: Policy algorithm gets required intents from what interfaces definitions/declarations?	7
AOB	7

Resolutions

Resolution: Minutes of TC meeting of 5th May are accepted
Resolution: Issue 53 moved to Open state
Resolution: Issue 54 moved to Open state
Resolution: Issue 54 moved to Open state

Actions

Action 20080512-01: Mike E & Michael R to work on new proposal wording for Issue 43
Action 20080512-02: Michael R and Mike Edwards: Combine the proposal for issue 52 with the proposal for Issue 55

Agenda

1. Roll call
2. Appointment of minute taker: Mike Edwards

3. Agenda bashing

4. Vote to accept minutes from May 5, 2008 meeting

<http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/sca-policy/download.php/28213/SCA%20Policy%20minutes%202007-05-05.html>

5. TC Logistics any questions about TC telecons or f2f?

6. ACTION ITEMS

a. Action 20080421-01: (Ashok, Mike E) Produce writeups of section 4.10 based on the 2 different approaches to push vs pull mechanisms in response to Issue 15

Partially done: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200804/msg00054.html>

b. Action 2008-05-05-01: Bezrukov/Malhotra to set up a ballot to ascertain the potential of quorum being attained

DONE

c. Action 2008-05-05-02: Malhotra to add to the write-up of the relationship between pull and push models, that one just adds in the policy sets and does so after step A of section 4.10.

d. Action 2008-05-05-03: Malhotra: Take the domain info set write-up and show how it should be merged with the policySet selection algorithm (4.10).

7. New Issues

a. ISSUE 53: How do we tell what a policySet @provides?

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200805/msg00006.html>

b. ISSUE 54: Wire validation rules have changed

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200805/msg00013.html>

c. ISSUE 55: Clarify the handling of intents

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200805/msg00014.html>

8. Issues

a. Issue 43: Use of intents from component type in policySet algorithm

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-43>

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200803/msg00008.html>

b. Discussion of how External Policy Attachment should be used.

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200804/msg00042.html>

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200804/msg00054.html>

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200805/msg00003.html>

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200805/msg00008.html>

c. ISSUE 52: Policy algorithm gets required intents from what interfaces definitions/declarations?

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-52>

d. Issue 49: Handling of Implementation Intents in the Implementation Hierarchy is not described. We need a proposal. <http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-49>

e. Issue 33: The ability to express capabilities via intents.

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-33>

f. ISSUE 26: Schema validateable authorization policy

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-26>

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200803/msg00019.html>

g. 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>

9. AOB

10. Any additions to the roll?

(Item 3) Agenda Bashing

No changes

(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC

Minutes of TC meeting of 5th May

Resolution: Minutes of TC meeting of 5th May are accepted

(Item 5) F2F Logistics

May 26 call is Memorial Day in USA

- Chairs will cancel that call

Question: Will the F2F get cancelled if it isn't going to make Quorum?

(Ashok) The assumption is that it will be on, whatever the numbers.

(Item 6) Action Items

a. Action 20080421-01: (Ashok, Mike E) Produce writeups of section 4.10 based on the 2 different approaches to push vs pull mechanisms in response to Issue 15

Partially done: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200804/msg00054.html>

Mike Edwards work still outstanding

b. Action 2008-05-05-01: Bezrukov/Malhotra to set up a ballot to ascertain the potential of quorum being attained

DONE

c. Action 2008-05-05-02: Malhotra to add to the write-up of the relationship between pull and push models, that one just adds in the policy sets and does so after step A of section 4.10.

Ashok waiting to discuss the material that Dave B discussed relating to Issue 38 resolution. It may be more that the 4.10 algorithm implies additive Policy Sets,

d. Action 2008-05-05-03: Malhotra: Take the domain infoSet write-up and show how it should be merged with the policySet selection algorithm (4.10).

d) Waiting on c) !

(Item 7) New Issues

ISSUE 53: How do we tell what a policySet @provides?

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-53>

Moved to open the issue - Ashok, seconded by Rich Levinson
Approved unanimously

Resolution: Issue 53 moved to Open state

ISSUE 54: Wire validation rules have changed

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-54>

Ashok: One way is to remove this from Policy and hand off to Assembly

Dave B: Problem is that there are policy wire matching statements

Move to accept - Dave Booz, Dale Moberg seconds

Accepted unanimously

Resolution: Issue 54 moved to Open state

ISSUE 55: Clarify the handling of intents

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-55>

Mike Edwards moves to open the issue, Dave B seconds

Agreed unanimously

Resolution: Issue 55 moved to Open state

Ashok - can this be linked to Issue 38?

(Item 8) Existing Issues

Issue 43: Use of intents from component type in policySet algorithm

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-43>

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200803/msg00008.html>

Dave Booz: For each element in the composite definition document that is a subtype of the abstract XSD elements <sca:binding> or <sca:implementation>, including any <sca:binding.sca> elements that are implied by the lack of other service or reference bindings:

A. Calculate the required intent set that applies to the target element as follows:

1. Start with the list of intents specified in the element's @requires attribute.
2. Add intents found in any related interface definition.
3. Add intents found in the @requires attribute of each ancestor element.
4. Add any required intents from the corresponding element of the component type. The element may not be present, but implied. Steps A1 to A3 should also be run on the component type to determine the required intents to use for that element.
5. If the element is a binding instance and its parent element (service, reference or callback) is wired, the required intents of the other side of the wire may be added to the intent set when they are available. This may simplify, or eliminate, the policy matching step later described in step C.
6. Remove any intents that do not include the target element's type in their @constrains attribute.
7. If the set of intents includes both a qualified version of an intent and an unqualified version of the same intent, remove the unqualified version from the set.

Since step 4 is new, the subsequent steps have been renumbered.

Michael R outlines the proposal

Mike E: Example use case - an Implementation with single service, used by a component

Component type has an intent foo on the service

Component Service gets foo, which is applied to any child binding elements

The proposal needs revision

Action 20080512-01: Mike E & Michael R to work on new proposal wording for Issue 43

Issue 15: External Policy Attachement

Wait on Ashok's action items

ISSUE 52: Policy algorithm gets required intents from what interfaces definitions/declarations?

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-52>

Michael R outlines usecases and possible solutions

- allow intents to be attached in all possible places
- mutual exclusive intents from different sources cause an error

Anish: this should be no different than including exclusive intents at the same level

Anish: +1 to saying that intent is part of the contract and it should never be violated

Solution is along the lines that all 4 locations contribute intents equally

- any clashes of exclusive intents is an error

Action 20080512-02: Michael R and Mike Edwards: Combine the proposal for issue 52 with the proposal for Issue 55

AOB

Next meeting 19th May 2008

Close of Business