Advancing E-Business Standards Since 1993

DRAFT

SCA-Policy TC F2F Meeting

SAP WallDorf, Germany

5/6 June 2008

Chair

Dave Booz, Ashok Malhotra

Scribe

Mike Edwards

Attendees

Name	Company	Status
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
Ashok Malhotra	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Jeff Mischkinsky	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Ron Barack	SAP AG*	Group Member
Vladislav Bezrukov	SAP AG*	Group Member
Sanjay Patil	SAP AG*	Group Member
Plamen Pavlov	SAP AG*	Group Member
Murty Gurajada	TIBCO Software Inc.	Group Member
Eisaku Nishiyama	Hitachi	Group Member

Contents

Resolutions

Resolution: Phone call of 9th June cancelled

Actions

Action: Mike Edwards to create description of sample policies to attach policies to specific places
Action: Ashok to send an email on the WSDL URI topic to the list
Action: Anish & Sanjay to write up a description of mechanism b)
Action: Ashok - provide a revised writeup of the XML strucutre for external attachment

Agenda

1. Roll call

2. Appointment of minute taker: Mike Edwards

3. Agenda bashing

4. Vote to accept minutes from May 26, 2008 meeting

5. TC Logistics: any questions about TC telecons or f2f?
Cancel June 9 telecon?

6. ACTION ITEMS

a. Action 2008-05-12-01: Mike Rowley & Mike Edwards to work on new proposal for Issue 43

b Action 2008-05-12-02: Mike Rowley & Mike Edwards to produce combined proposal to resolve issues 52 and 55

7. New Issues
None.

8. Issues
a. Issue 15 External Policy Attachment.
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200805/msg00025.html
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200804/msg00054.html
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200805/msg00029.html

b. Issue 23 Policy attachment at the message level
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-23

c. Issue 27 Operation-level policy attachment is broken
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-27

d. Issue 28: Add the ability to attach policy directly to an SCA compositehttp://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-28

e. 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

f. ISSUE 52: Policy algorithm gets required intents from what interfaces definitions/declarations?
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-52

g. Issue 56: Intents conflicting with binding configuration
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200805/msg00027.html

h. 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

I. Issue 33: The ability to express capabilities via intents.
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-33

j 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

k. 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

l. Issue 53: How do we tell what a policySet provides?
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-53

9. AOB

10. Any additions to the roll?

(Item 3) Agenda Bashing

No changes

(Item 5) Future Meetings

Phone call of 9th June – cancelled without objection

Resolution: Phone call of 9th June cancelled

(Item 6) Action Items

a. Action 2008-05-12-01: Mike Rowley & Mike Edwards to work on new proposal for Issue 43

b Action 2008-05-12-02: Mike Rowley & Mike Edwards to produce combined proposal to resolve issues 52 and 55

No progress on either of these - still outstanding

(Item 7) New Issues

None

(Item 8) Existing Issues

Issue 15: External Policy Attachement

http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200805/msg00025.html
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200805/msg00029.html

Ashok outlines the basis of the proposal
2 use cases:

1) Ability to apply Policy after deployment
2) Ability to express rules by which policy is used

Discussion of "Domain Infoset" concept
Wording proposal:
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200805/msg00025.html

"Issue 15 - Wording Prposal.doc"

Section: "New Subsection: Processing the Infoset"

Anish: what does it mean by 'applying policy after deployment'? How does that work?
<discussion of the point in the deployment process at which application of Policy is done>

The Infoset URIs (still dependent on resolution of an Assembly issue)
- the tweaking of the structure of the Infoset regarding Interfaces & Bindings

Sanjay: Mike, I wonder how your alternative proposal would look like?

Dave Booz: I'm curious how Ron would attach a policy to a message

Ron Barack makes the point that the external attachment mechanism should not be complicated with things like XPath functions for picking out Operations, Messages etc

Ron Barack: I haven't been following Policy, and am not aware of all the motivating use-cases. Up to now, only "governance" and "unmodifiable scdl-s" had been named. Applying policies to messages was a new use-case for me.

Dave Booz: if we could get rid of intents as the means for selecting something in a policySet then we can seperate intents out as a means for developers and assemblers to express abstract requirements, which is their primary purpose. I really hate to lose that capability of intents

Ron Barack: +1
Ron Barack: I am unconvinced by the "unmodifiable scdl" use-case

Ashok: Dave, then how do you find policySets that satisfy an intent?
Dave Booz: Ashok, same way as always...my suggestion doesn't affect finding policySets
Dave Booz: Ron, I'm floored...you've never had to deal with a bank or or other regulated industry that has to be able to certify that the application package has been audited to not be malicious...this is done by signing the application after building it and then at deployment time you cannot modify the scdl because you will invalidate the signed package (contribution). We see this as very common.

Bob: Please don't define an xpath subset. It would take us years
Dave Booz: +1 to Bob

Ron is objecting to the idea of anyone other than the developer picking out some detailed part of the assembly, like a message. He prefers the developer to attach the intent to a message or to an operation.

Ron Barack: Well, I deal with SAP customers that don't want to violate their warranties and therefore, cannot crack things open.

Mike Edwards: How do warranties play here? Who is building the "things".
Dave Booz: Ron, ok same problem...I think that also supports the unmodifiable scdl use case
Ron Barack: But that's why we have intents, right?
Dave Booz: I didn't understand that...intents are not in play in the unmodifiable scdl discussion - intents will be in the signed package.
Mike Edwards: The bit I want to understand here - ok, so the packages have their intents, but the actual policies applied will depend on the specific environment into which the packages are deployed, right?
Dave Booz: Yes from me, Ron what do you think
Ron Barack: Right... in this case, SAP supplies the intent "secure" and the customer defines what it means. Exactly so the customer doesn't have to crack the package...I thought that was the point of intents.

Dave Booz: OK good, so then this ext. attachment mechanism gives you a standard means for describing what policySet was selected to satisfy those intents
Mike Edwards: Right - this is all fine
Dave Booz: Mike, can you capture in the chat what is being agreed?

Mike Edwards: With external attachment, this would be "attachment via intents" - ie the external attachment mechanism would specify the intent in its target expression

Ron Barack: What is the relationship between ext. attachtments and the framework that maps policies to intents.
Dave Booz: Ron, there are two proposals for that.
Mike Edwards: You mean the existing framework, Ron?

Ron Barack: The ext. attachments uses SCDL location, not intent.
Mike Edwards: No, that is not the case
Dave Booz: The xpath expression can pick out locations that have a specific intent attached

Mike Edwards: you can write an XPath expression that basically just says "where the intent "X" is present" - //[@requires="confidentiality"] is an example

Mike Edwards: I could propose a function for this too eg. WhereIntentValues("confidentiality integrity")

Ron Barack: I'd be in favor of these functions... I'm just not for picking things out based on deployed scdl location. The idea was presented more as replacement for the existing PF, not as its completion.

Dave Booz: The XPath expression that Mike showed could be a replacement for the "pull" mechanism that is in the current PF. By pull mechanism, I mean the algorithm that goes out and finds policySets to satisfy intents specified in the app.

Martin C morphed into Craving for Spargel

Mike Edwards: OK, so what I think I'm hearing Ron say is that he does not want the capability to customise policy based on the particular usage of a component. That all uses of a given component must use the same policy.

Ron Barack: So, intents no longer have any meaning, other than as things that are pointed to by this extension framework. Is that right?

Mike Edwards: They have the precise meaning that they had before - all that is changing is how intents participate in the attachment of Policy Sets to the places where the intents are expressed. Currently, those intents drive the complex algorithm in 4.10 - in this external attachment model, they can be used explicitly in a way that the Policy Guru decides.

Look at the Syntax – in the proposal document

Michael Rowley: BTW, replacing the pull model with the external attachment mechanism doesn't mean removing the 4.10 algorithm. Almost all of that will still be needed for external attachments. The only thing that goes away is step E: "Choose the smallest collection of additional policySets that match all remaining required intents."

Dave Booz: What I said on the call is that we could decide to put the intent normalization parts of 4.10 into XPath functions and then allow the ext. attachment expression to invoke them or not. Puts ALL the control of how intent matching into the hands of the external attacher. Certainly a radical idea.
.
Michael Rowley: Wow, that is radical.

Ashok: As I heard the proposal ... you attach intents to SCDL elements and then, using External Attachment attach policySets that satisfy those intents ... so need for 4.10

Anish presents a new idea, which removes the PolicySets and the Bindings from the SCDL, and applies them entirely via the external attachment mechanism

Mike Edwards takes the view that moving that material from lower-level composites is OK, but that removing it from the deployment composites makes much less sense.

Michael Rowley makes the comment that this generally may be OK, but that there is a concern not to make the simple cases more complex and quotes the example of Google Guice which has taken the extreme of having no XML and is getting traction with it.

Ashok: Question: what to do about conflicting policies?
Discussion starts of the Process (sequencing etc) by which the attachment takes place

anish morphed into spargel sausage with spargel, that doesn`t have much spargel

Mike Edwards: What do people think of this resolution of the conflict problem?
We could simply state to the policy guys that the external attachment statements must not cause a conflict - ie construct your attachment point statements in a way that never are 2 conflicting policies attached in the same place.

Dave Booz: but invariably someone will ask for a tool to validate that. That could be a vendor specific problem to solve.

Mike Edwards: Agreed Dave, it could be resolved that way. Conflicts: "there should be none - but we say no more"

Bob: We could say that those causing conflict shall be sanctioned.

Questions still unanswered:

1) Is this interesting for operation & message level attachment?

Action: Mike Edwards to create description of sample policies to attach policies to specific places

Ashok: Advises the use of WSDL URI structure (as defined in WSDL specs) for identifying parts of an interface

Action: Ashok to send an email on the WSDL URI topic to the list

3) What happens to the current "pull" mechanism?

Alternative views:
a) New mechanism simply adds policies on top of those caculated by the "pull" mechanism
b) New mechanism is the ONLY way of adding Policy and Binding information to the Domain

Action: Anish & Sanjay to write up a description of mechanism b)

4) Will the external attachment mechanism be used to attach intents?
>> "Yes"

5) Is the external attachment mechanism extensible in order to allow vendors to use additional context in the attachment point?

Possibly another way to state the same question is to consider the use of vendor extensions in the infoset as being available for inclusion in an XPath attachment expression.

-> Yes, it's extensible in this way

Ashok: Make sure we don't restrict this accidentally

6) Can the external attachment mechanism be used to attach anything that a deployer might do to an SCA application during deployment, such as attachment of a binding(s)?

There is a proposal from Anish which would make it possible to attach bindings as well as Policies
(subject of action item to #3 above)

Bob +1 for one algorithm. It is I think more under the developer's control.

7) Attachment of capabilities (Issue 33) should be possible through the external attachment mechanism? This is similar to attachment of intents except that they would probably not be attached to @requires.

Ashok: We will take up issue 33 tomorrow

Mike Edwards: XML structure of the attachment mechanism needs to be defined.

Action: Ashok - provide a revised writeup of the XML strucutre for external attachment

AOB

Next meeting June 16th.
Close of Business