

DRAFT***SCA-Policy TC Teleconference******07 December 2009******Chairs***

Dave Booz, Ashok Malhotra

Scribe

Mike Edwards

Attendees

| Name | Company | Status |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Robert Freund | Hitachi, Ltd. | Group Member |
| 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 |
| Anish Karmarkar | Oracle Corporation | Group Member |
| Ashok Malhotra | Oracle Corporation | Group Member |
| Plamen Pavlov | SAP AG* | Group Member |
| Fabian Ritzmann | Sun Microsystems | Group Member |
| Tai-Hsing Cha | TIBCO Software Inc. | Group Member |

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| Resolutions..... | 2 |
| Actions..... | 2 |
| Agenda..... | 2 |
| (Item 3) Agenda Bashing..... | 4 |
| (Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC..... | 4 |
| (Item 5) TC Administrivia..... | 4 |
| (Item 6) PRD Status..... | 4 |
| (Item 7) Action Items..... | 4 |
| (Item 8) New Issues..... | 4 |
| ISSUE 110: Should intents be ignorable?..... | 4 |
| ISSUE 111: Asynch methods and Transactions..... | 5 |
| (Item 10) Open Issues..... | 5 |
| ISSUE 92: Block Intent Inheritance..... | 5 |
| AOB..... | 6 |

Resolutions

Minutes of Policy TC meeting of November 16th are accepted

Issue 110 is opened

Issue 111 is opened

Issue 92 is deferred

Actions

ACTION 20091207-01: Mike to raise issue against the wording implying that all intents are supplied via a single definitions.xml file, which contradicts the Assembly spec.

Agenda

1. Roll call

2. Confirm minute taker

3. Agenda bashing

4. Meeting Minutes

Vote to accept minutes from Nov 16 2009

- <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/35214/SCA%20Policy%20minutes%202009-11-16.pdf>

5. TC Administrivia:

a. Recording issue status - 2 Open

b. LOA Request - Fabian Ritsmann - starting Nov 30

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200911/msg00061.html>

c. LOA Request - Murty Gurajada - starting Dec 7

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200911/msg00064.html>

6. PRD status update
 - a. 9 issues from PR 01 comment list that still need responses (Dave)
7. ACTION ITEMS:
 - a. 20091019-03: owner=AshokM status=pending Write detailed proposal for POLICY-92
 - b. 20091116-01: owner=AshokM status=done To raise a new issue relating to the Intent Override wording
8. New Issues
 - a. ISSUE 110: Should intents be ignorable?
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-110>
 - b. ISSUE 111: Asynch methods and Transactions
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-111>
9. Blocking Issue Discussion
None
10. Additional Issue Discussion
 - a. ISSUE 93: Allow external attachment for intents
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-93>
proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200911/msg00002.html>
latest: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200912/msg00002.html>
 - b. ISSUE 92: Block Intent Inheritance
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-92>
latest: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200912/msg00000.html>
11. Testing
 - a. Test Status:
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200911/msg00047.html>
 - Test Assertion Document:
DOC: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/35139/SCA-Policy-1.1-Test-Assertions-WD-05.doc>
PDF: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/35138/SCA-Policy-1.1-Test-Assertions-WD-05.pdf>
 - Test Case Documents
ODT: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/35141/sca-policy-1.1-testcases-wd02.odt>
PDF: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/35140/sca-policy-1.1-testcases-wd02.pdf>
 - Testcase code:
<http://tools.oasis-open.org/version-control/svn/sca-policy/TestCases/>
12. AOB
 - a. straggler roll

(Item 3) Agenda Bashing

No changes

(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC

Minutes from 16th November 2009

Minutes approved without change

Resolution: Minutes of Policy TC meeting of November 16th are accepted

(Item 5) TC Administrivia

LOA request for Murty Gurajada

- Granted

(Item 6) PRD Status

9 issues from PR 01 comment list that still need responses (Dave)

(Item 7) Action Items

a. 20091019-03: owner=AshokM status=pending Write detailed proposal for POLICY-92

b. 20091116-01: owner=AshokM status=done To raise a new issue relating to the Intent
Override wording

(Item 8) New Issues

ISSUE 110: Should intents be ignorable?

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-110>

Ashok explains the issue

Ashok would like to remove the words that talk about forcing deployment when an intent is not satisfied

Anish: the runtime MUST raise an error if the intents are not satisfied (somehow), IMHO

Dave: The related normative statement here has a SHOULD rather than a MUST so the optionality is stated there

Anish: is this wording in rev-6?

Dave: Yes

Ashok: The question here is about something that is a clear error situation - the question is whether the spec should say anything specific about what happens after the error is raised

Ashok moves to open Policy Issue 110

Anish seconds

Motion passes unanimously

Resolution: Issue 110 is opened

ISSUE 111: Asynch methods and Transactions

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-111>

Ashok outlines the issue
Ashok moves to open Issue 111
Mike seconds
Motion passes unanimously

Resolution: Issue 111 is opened

(Item 10) Open Issues

ISSUE 92: Block Intent Inheritance

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-92>

latest: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200912/msg00000.html>

Ashok describes the points he made in the email above
- what happens if an intent applied higher up does not apply to something at the lower level
- it can create errors
"Intents are supposed to be simple"

Dave Booz response:
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200912/msg00005.html>
- this discusses "capabilities"

Mike Edwards response:
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200912/msg00006.html>

Dave: could have been addressed with "capabilities"
- but not appropriate for now
- that was simply an observation
- I don't understand the argument here since placement of intents at the higher level is there to make easy the case where the intents ARE all the same (otherwise you have to add the intent at all the lower levels)
Dave: I'm not convinced that the convenience is outweighed by the error cases
Ashok: My view is the opposite

Mike: I really take the view that the placement at a higher level is a great convenience.
To lose this makes it harder
Ashok: I think that it is complex and can create significant difficulties

EricW: We should not compensate for incompetence - if an assembler doesn't understand what is going on they shouldn't be doing it!
EricW: How (in general) do you know an intent "does not apply"

EricW: Surely that is the assemblers job - and if they don't know what applies why are they doing the job?

Mike: +1 Eric

Mike: I think this is exactly the same as the case of Java annotations that can apply at either the class level or at the method level

EricW: I think you HAVE to have an error when that is the most likely situation for a competent assembler - you have to know what you are doing when you use them

Eric: It would be better to wait until we can do capabilities - let's not introduce anything new at this stage and do enhancements for 1.2

Bob: better to defer

Mike moves to defer Issue 92

Bob seconds

EricW: This is really "capabilities by the backdoor" - I would rather defer the issue until we can discuss that in detail (for 1.2)

Vote:

YES = 6 NO = 3 ABSTAIN = 0

Motion passes by majority

Resolution: Issue 92 is deferred

AOB

Ashok asks a question about a statement that all intents must be in a definitions.xml file. Would prefer it if the standard intents could be supplied to the Domain by other means (eg from a D/B associated with the runtime)

ACTION 20091207-01: Mike to raise issue against the wording implying that all intents are supplied via a single definitions.xml file, which contradicts the Assembly spec.

Next meeting 14 December

Close of Business