



Advancing E-Business Standards Since 1993

***DRAFT***

***SCA-Policy TC F2F Meeting***

***28/29 January 2009***

***Chair***

Dave Booz, Ashok Malhotra

***Scribe***

Mike Edwards

***Attendees***

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Status</b>
Eric Wells	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
David Booz	IBM	Group Member
Mike Edwards	IBM	Group Member
Simon Holdsworth	IBM	Group Member
Martin Chapman	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Rich Levinson	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Ashok Malhotra	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Sanjay Patil	SAP AG*	Group Member
Plamen Pavlov	SAP AG*	Group Member
Murty Gurajada	TIBCO Software Inc.	Group Member

## **Contents**

Resolutions.....	2
Actions .....	2
Agenda .....	3
(Item 3) Agenda Bashing .....	5
(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC .....	5
(Item 5) TC Logistics.....	5
(Item 6) Action Items.....	5
(Item 7) New Issues .....	6
(Item 8) Existing Issues .....	6
ISSUE 57: Fine grain authorization intent.....	6
Issue 33 Capabilities .....	7
ISSUE 65: Where can interaction intents be attached? Where can implementation intents by attached?.....	8
ISSUE 66: Tighten XML Schema for Intent Definition.....	8
Issue 62 RFC2119 text updates.....	8
AOB.....	10

## **Resolutions**

<b>Resolution:</b> <b>accepted</b>	<b>Minutes of TC meeting of Jan 12 2009 are</b>
<b>Resolution:</b> <b>accepted</b>	<b>Minutes of TC meeting of Jan 19 2009 are</b>
<b>Resolution:</b>	<b>Issue 33 is closed with no action</b>
<b>Resolution:</b>	<b>Issue 65 is Closed with No Action</b>
<b>Resolution:</b> <b>minutes</b>	<b>Issue 66 is Resolved using the proposal in the</b>

## **Actions**

- Action 20090128-01 (Rich L) Fix the example in 7.3.2 to add the appropriate namespace**
- Action 20090128-02 (Rich) Add a fineGrain intent - have the policySet provide this intent and then have the XACML inline within the policySet**
- Action 20090128-03: Move [POL20001] to the end of section 4.10.1**
- Action 20090128-04: (Dave) Create a normative statement in an appropriate section which reflects the non normative words at the end of section 2.3**
- Action 20090128-05: Add a normative statement requiring the @name attribute of an intent to be unique in the Domain (line 25**

Action 20090128-06: Remove [POL30014] (line 262 )

Action 20090128-07: Change [POL30004] to read "If an intent has more than one qualifier, one and only one of the qualifiers MUST be declared as the default qualifier.

Action 20090128-08: Change [POL30004] to read "One and only one of the qualifiers MUST be declared as the default qualifier."

Action 20090128-09: (Ashok) Add a reference to the XPath specification for the description of the @appliesTo attribute

Action 20090128-10: Reword the "should" statements in the 3rd paragraph following the example in 4.3

Action 20090128-11: Reword the "should" statement in the 6th paragraph following the example in 4.3

Action 20090128-12: Remove the final paragraph of 3.4 (about normatively defined PolicySets)

Action 20090128-13 change POL30020 to "If a policySet or intentMap specifies " and then delete POL30009

Action 20090128-14: Change POL30010 For each qualifiable intent listed

Action 20090128-15: Remove conformance statement [POL30012]

Action 20090128-16: (Dave) Rework the wording of [POL30013] to deal with what "compatible" means in this case

Action 20090128-17: Replace "should" with "ought" in the paragraph immediately above the BasicAuthMsgProtSecurity example

Action 20090128-18: (Dave) Add a formal definition section for the <policySetAttachment/> element

Action 20090128-19: Remove [POL40002].

Action 20090128-20: Section 4.4 consider normative statements which are needed to deal with the case of deploying (new) PolicySets to a Domain that already contains deployed artifacts (such as Composites)

Action 20090128-21: Section 4.4.1 bullet 3, change parenthesis to read "rather than to all uses of the composite"

Action 20090128-22: Reconsider the wording of section 4.4.2 to remove ambiguities and also to ensure that "ancestor inheritance" is properly addressed

## ***Agenda***

1. Roll call
2. Confirm minute taker

### 3. Agenda bashing

### 4. Meeting Minutes

Vote to accept minutes from Jan 12, 2009 meeting

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200901/msg00041.html>

Vote to accept minutes from Jan 19, 2009 meeting

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200901/msg00041.html>

### 5. TC Logistics:

- a. Recording issue status - 6 Open

### 6. ACTION ITEMS

- a. 20081124-01: Rich L & Ashok - Build the detailed proposal for the resolution of Issue 57

- b. 20090105-01: Dave B to write up spec text for Issue 33 based on latest proposal

- c. 20090112-01: (Mike E) Raise an Issue regarding lack of formal XML definition of Intents defined in the Policy spec.

DONE

- d. 20090112-02: (Ashok) Raise an issue regarding the places where interaction intents can be attached

DONE

### 7. New Issues

- a. ISSUE-67: Remove references to conversations

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-67>

### 8. Issue Discussion

- a. ISSUE-62: RFC2119 text updates

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-62>

Proposal:

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200901/msg00044.html>

- b. ISSUE-33: Capabilities

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

Proposal:

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200901/msg00053.html>

- c. ISSUE 57: Fine grain authorization intent

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-57>

Proposal:

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200901/msg00052.html>

- d. ISSUE 64: Policy Specification is missing formal definitions of the various Intents

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-64>

Proposal:

e. ISSUE 65: Where can interaction intents be attached? Where can implementation intents be attached?

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-65>

Proposal:

f. ISSUE 66: Tighten XML Schema for Intent Definition

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-66>

Proposal:

9. Testing Discussion

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200901/msg00045.html>

10. AOB

a. straggler roll

### ***(Item 3) Agenda Bashing***

Dave: Lets do 57 first, then 33

Plamen: Can we do 66 after 33?

Order: 57, 33, 65, 66 and then work on the RFC 2119 language work

### ***(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC***

Vote to accept minutes from Jan 12, 2009 meeting

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200901/msg00041.html>

Vote to accept minutes from Jan 19, 2009 meeting

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200901/msg00041.html>

Both sets of minutes are approved without objection

**Resolution: Minutes of TC meeting of Jan 12 2009 are  
accepted**

**Resolution: Minutes of TC meeting of Jan 19 2009 are  
accepted**

### ***(Item 5) TC Logistics***

### ***(Item 6) Action Items***

## ***(Item 7) New Issues***

## ***(Item 8) Existing Issues***

### **ISSUE 57: Fine grain authorization intent**

<http://www.osea.org/jira/browse/POLICY-57>

Proposal:

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200901/msg00052.html>

Using the document "Issue 57 wording-ashok-rich-1.doc" contained in the email...

Ashok gives the rationale for the material in the document

Mike E: Section 7.3.2 - the policySet example does not have namespace specified for the XACML elements

#### **Action 20090128-01 (Rich L) Fix the example in 7.3.2 to add the appropriate namespace**

Dave: Does this imply changing the wrapper tag?

Dave: Why is the XACML inside the <authorization/> element? Shouldn't the XACML elements be inlined directly?

Rich: We need a place to put the fine grained attribute....

(see following section)

<discussion of @fineGrain on the <authorization/> element >

Ashok: What's different in the second (fineGrain) case?

Rich: With fineGrained, then business logic is being extracted from the business code and put into the authorization domain

<discussion of the use case for fine grained authorization>

Ashok: This material needs a preamble to help explain the context

Rich: This is the skeleton for the actual changes and it needs fleshing out if people agree with the direction

Ashok: Resolve issue 57 with the first part of this proposal and leave fineGrained until later

Rich: But Issue 57 IS about fineGrained

Dave: OK with the first part as it is really an example - but the fineGrain stuff is normative

Why do we need the fineGrain attribute?

Rich: Need to assure that the fine grained policy is applied

The policy provider must provide this fine grained capability

Dave: An attribute on the policy set is not the right way to do this

Mike E: This is better done as an intent

Dave: Yes, this is done as an intent - and implementation types (etc) can then say whether they support it or not

Dave: An implementation intent

Ashok: This will require some more work

#### **Action 20090128-02 (Rich) Add a fineGrain intent - have the policySet provide this intent and then have the XACML inline within the policySet**

Rich: Will affect 7.1 which deals with Security intents

Ashok: I'm concerned about Schedule

Dave: An implementation intent somewhere in 7.3

Rich agrees to write up a modified proposal right away and we can take a look at it later in this meeting

<completes discussion of Issue 57 for the present>

## Issue 33 Capabilities

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

Proposal:

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200901/msg00053.html>

See sca-policy-1[1].1-spec-CD01-Rev11+issue33.doc

Section 4.9

Dave describes the proposal

(Part 1) @neverProvides for a bindingType or implementationType

(Part 2) is about capabilities on services - too much work for now - happy to leave this for now

Resolve the issue with part 1 only - can revisit Part 2 at same later time

So this proposal is for Part 1 only

Ashok: I prefer a different name "cannotProvide"

Dave: I would prefer an editorial pass over the document to improve the wording (no normative changes)

Sanjay: It seems easier to maintain using the other option that Dave presented - rather than "neverProvides" - have a positive list of supported intents

<Discussion of the meaning of the proposal and the alternative formulation>

Sanjay: Do you need a 3rd attribute at all?

Dave: 3 cases - you get it always, you get it if you specify the intent, you get it if you specify the intent and you attach a policySet attached

<Examination of a number of examples>

<long discussion of the meaning of alwaysProvides, mayProvides and the intents provided by policySets>

Plamen: Thinks that the negative list is not preferable to the positive list when new intents are added to the universe of intents

Section 5.1 has the changes for Implementation Type ...here there are typically NOT policySets

Plamen: doesn't it makes sense to have provide attribute for implementation types?

Sanjay - perhaps only do this for implementation types, where there are typically no policySets

Dave Booz: Move to close Issue 33 with no action

Second: Sanjay

Motion accepted w/o

**Resolution: Issue 33 is closed with no action**

**ISSUE 65: Where can interaction intents be attached? Where can implementation intents be attached?**

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-65>

Ashok discusses the issue

Mike E moves to close Issue 65 with no action

Sanjay seconds

Ashok points out that the @appliesTo attribute on the intent can be used to specify what the intent applies to

Motion accepted

**Resolution: Issue 65 is Closed with No Action**

**ISSUE 66: Tighten XML Schema for Intent Definition**

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-66>

Ashok says that the type of the @intentType attribute should be changed to an enumerated type with the two values "interaction" and "implementation"

<detail of the proposal to be left to the editors>

Proposal to Resolve issue 66:

Create a new type which is a restriction of "xs:string" which has 2 values "interaction" and "implementation" and to use this new type as the type of the @intentType attribute

Ashok moves to Resolve 66 using the proposal in the minutes

Seconded by Murthy

Motion Accepted w/o

**Resolution: Issue 66 is Resolved using the proposal in the minutes**

**Issue 62 RFC2119 text updates**

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-62>

See Policy spec update: sca-policy-1[1].1-spec-CD01-Rev13a.doc

Section 2

Section 2.3

First paragraph contains a normative statement

Dave: I think that this statement [POL20001] should be moved to another section.

Section 2 is descriptive section and non-normative

Dave: It should go in 4.10.1 ...after line 1558 at the end of 4.10.1



### **Action 20090128-03: Move [POL20001] to the end of section 4.10.1**

End of section 2.3 - last sentence seems to have something normative in it.

No - it is descriptive in this section.

Dave: There is a normative statement in section 4 [POL40007]

### **Action 20090128-04: (Dave) Create a normative statement in an appropriate section which reflects the non normative words at the end of section 2.3**

Section 3

Section 3.1

@name attribute (line 257) - need to add a normative statement about the uniqueness of intent names

Sanjay: The Assembly spec already has a normative statement which requires that the QNames of all entries within <definitions/> files must be unique in the Domain - this is [ASM10001] in Section10

### **Action 20090128-05: Add a normative statement requiring the @name attribute of an intent to be unique in the Domain (line 25**

### **Action 20090128-06: Remove [POL30014] (line 262 )**

### **Action 20090128-07: Change [POL30004] to read "If an intent has more than one qualifier, one and only one of the qualifiers MUST be declared as the default qualifier.**

### **Action 20090128-08: Change [POL30004] to read "One and only one of the qualifiers MUST be declared as the default qualifier."**

Section 3.2

Section 3.3

Section 3.4

### **Action 20090128-09: (Ashok) Add a reference to the XPath specification for the description of the @appliesTo attribute**

### **Action 20090128-10: Reword the "should" statements in the 3rd paragraph following the example in 4.3**

### **Action 20090128-11: Reword the "should" statement in the 6th paragraph following the example in 4.3**

### **Action 20090128-12: Remove the final paragraph of 3.4 (about normatively defined PolicySets)**

Section 3.4.1

### **Action 20090128-13 change POL30020 to "If a policySet or intentMap specifies " and then delete POL30009**

### **Action 20090128-14: Change POL30010 For each qualifiable intent listed**

Section 3.4.2

Section 3.4.2

Section 3.4.3

**Action 20090128-15: Remove conformance statement [POL30012]**

**Action 20090128-16: (Dave) Rework the wording of [POL30013] to deal with what "compatible" means in this case**

**Action 20090128-17: Replace "should" with "ought" in the paragraph immediately above the BasicAuthMsgProtSecurity example**

**Action 20090128-18: (Dave) Add a formal definition section for the <policySetAttachment/> element**

Section 4.3

**Action 20090128-19: Remove [POL40002].**

Section 4.4

**Action 20090128-20: Section 4.4 consider normative statements which are needed to deal with the case of deploying (new) PolicySets to a Domain that already contains deployed artifacts (such as Composites)**

Section 4.4.1

Bullet marked 3

**Action 20090128-21: Section 4.4.1 bullet 3, change parenthesis to read "rather than to all uses of the composite"**

Section 4.4.2

**Action 20090128-22: Reconsider the wording of section 4.4.2 to remove ambiguities and also to ensure that "ancestor inheritance" is properly addressed**

Stopped just before Section 4.5

Recess

**AOB**

Next meeting Feb 8th

Close of Business