OASIS Advancing E-Business Standards Since 1993

FINAL

SCA-Policy TC Teleconference

20 October 2008

Chair

Dave Booz

Scribe

Mike Edwards

Attendees

Name	Company	Status
Fred Carter	AmberPoint	Group Member
Dale Moberg	Axway Software*	Group Member
Tom Rutt	Fujitsu Limited*	Group Member
Eric Wells	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
Michael Beisiegel	IBM	Group Member
David Booz	IBM	Group Member
Mike Edwards	IBM	Group Member
Simon Holdsworth	IBM	Group Member
Anish Karmarkar	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Rich Levinson	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Sanjay Patil	SAP AG*	Group Member
Plamen Pavlov	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

Contents

Resolutions

Resolution: **Meeting minutes of TC F2F meeting of 13th October 2008 accepted.**
Resolution: **Issue 49 is closed with no action**

Actions

None

Agenda

1. Roll call

2. Confirm minute taker, Mike Edwards

3. Agenda bashing

4. Meeting Minutes
Vote to accept minutes from Oct 13, 2008 meeting
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00024.html

5. TC Logistics:
a. Recording issue status - 10 Open

6. ACTION ITEMS
a. Dave Booz to provide proposal for issue 33
b. 20081002-01: (Mike E) Inform the Assembly TC of removal of element.
c. 20081002-02: (Rich L and Ashok) - Prepare a detailed proposal for a resolution of issue 57 (Target Nov 10)
d. 20081002-04: (Ashok) To prepare a full proposal for Issue 32 for an intent which conveys the need for mutual authentication (Target Nov 10)
e. 20081002-05: (Dave B) Prepare the proposal that will resolve Issue 54
DONE

f. 20081002-06: (Ashok) to prepare the specification wording for Issue 46 resolution, plus an updated XSD (Target Nov 10)

7. New Issues
a. none

8. Issue Discussion
a. ISSUE 49: Handling of Implementation Intents in the Implementation Hierarchy is not described
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-49

Original Proposal:
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00006.html

b. ISSUE 59: Limit policySet attachment to bindings
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-59

Discussion:
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200809/msg00028.html

Original Proposal:
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200808/msg00012.html

c. ISSUE-60: Clarify scope of ordered intent
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-60

Proposal:
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00025.html

d. ISSUE-61: How are mayProvides intents on bindings satisfied
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-61

Proposal:
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00032.html

e. ISSUE-54: Wire validation rules have changed
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-54

Proposal:
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00028.html

f. ISSUE 57: Fine grain authorization intent
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-57

Original Proposal:
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00010.html

g. ISSUE-35: Define Conformance Target
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-35

h. ISSUE-48: Transaction defaults are not optimal
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-48

i. ISSUE-33: Capabilities
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-33
proposal:

j. ISSUE-32: Security intent which allows a client to authenticate a server
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-32
proposal:

k. ISSUE-44: Need a clear way to distinguish Implementation Intents from Interaction
Intents
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-44
proposal: waiting to see if we need it

9. AOB
a. straggler roll

(Item 3) Agenda Bashing

No changes

(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC

Vote to accept minutes from Oct 13th, 2008 meeting
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00024.html

Resolution: **Meeting minutes of TC F2F meeting of 13th
October 2008 accepted.**

(Item 5) TC Logistics

a. Recording issue status - 10 Open

(Item 6) Action Items

a. Dave Booz to provide proposal for issue 33
Oustanding
b. 20081002-01: (Mike E) Inform the Assembly TC of removal of <operation/> element.
Outstanding
c. 20081002-02: (Rich L and Ashok) - Prepare a detailed proposal for a resolution of issue 57 (Target Nov 10)
d. 20081002-04: (Ashok) To prepare a full proposal for Issue 32 for an intent which conveys the need for mutual authentication (Target Nov 10)
Outstanding
e. 20081002-05: (Dave B) Prepare the proposal that will resolve Issue 54
DONE
f. 20081002-06: (Ashok) to prepare the specification wording for Issue 46 resolution, plus an updated XSD (Target Nov 10)
Outstanding

(Item 7) New Issues

None

(Item 8) Existing Issues

ISSUE 49: Handling of Implementation Intents in the Implementation
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-49

Original Proposal:
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00006.html

Sanjay describes original proposal
Anish: what defines an intent as an implementation/interaction intent. Is it the @constrains attribute on <intent> element?

Dave Booz: that's the closest we have...there is an issue open to add something concrete to an intent definition...at the F2F we informally agreed to leave that issue until we find a requirement for such a concrete marking.

Anish: sanjay's proposal would, it seems to me, require such a marking
Dave Booz: yes

Mike E raises the point about the ability to mark a <composite/> element with an implementation intent which then flows down.

Sanjay thinks that it is very different in that the composite builder has all of the lower level components in view at the time they mark the <composite/> element

Discussion of the meaning of the implementationType structure which lists intents

Discussion of what is known about a runtime container at design time.

Mike E - SCA is deliberately loose about what the capabilities of an actual runtime container are - unlike JEE for example

Anish - I'm trying to understand the different scenarios

Sanjay: I would be fine with removing the capability to attach implementation intents at the <composite/> element level

Sanjay: Need a way for the designer to be able to resolve conflict where some runtime is not capable of honouring a given implementation intent

Anish: are we arguing about what essentially boils down to syntactic sugars, or am I not getting it?

Dave: I see the design time problem (capabilities) that we're getting into is covered under Issue 33. But I don't get why there is this need to drill down into a composite

Dave draws a distinction between a component that can declare that it cannot do certain things (marked via intents) versus the ability of a runtime to declare that it cannot handle components marked in some specific ways

Anish: I'm a little confused about how all these issues: declaring intents that are not supported, design-time v. runtime error generation; are related to whether a non-atomic component inherits implementation intents. These issues are important, but I don't understand how they affect the issue at hand

Sanjay - Would like a standard way to detect no later than deployment time that the runtime cannot deal with the requirements of the application

Anish - I'm not sure how these issues are related. All good questions, but we allow intents to be declared on a component - and all these problems occur when you use intents in that way - what difference does it make if the intents are inherited?

Sanjay - the core of this issue is that we dont have a way to detect before execution that there is a problem (can't run the implementation)

Dave B: Discusses the meaning of Issue 33 further

Sanjay - Detection of conflicts before the runtime is one requirement. Also, external attachment of intents would allow specific attachment of policy as required.

Dave Booz: Issue 15 definitely does'nt allow for external attachment of intents - but nor does the resolution seem to disallow it, so this could be opened as a new issue

Anish: if external attachments are about deployment, why would you attach intents as opposed to policysets?
Mike E: I agree Anish - that's why we left intents out of the resolution of #15

Sanjay moves to close Issue 49 with no action
Plamen seconds

Resolution: Issue 49 is closed with no action

Close of business

Issue Status Reporting - for Liaison Committee

9 open issues
0 opened today
1 closed today

AOB

Next meeting 27th Oct
Close of Business