DRAFT

SCA-Policy TC F2F Meeting, Redwood Shores

24 & 25 Jan 2008

Chair

Dave Booz, Ashok Malhotra

Scribe

Mike Edwards

Attendees

Name	Company	Status
Dale Moberg	Axway Software*	Group Member
Michael Rowley	BEA Systems, Inc.	Group Member
Tom Rutt	Fujitsu Limited*	Group Member
Robert Freund	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
Eisaku Nishiyama	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
Michael Beisiegel	IBM	Group Member
David Booz	IBM	Group Member
Jean-Sebastien Delfino	IBM	Group Member
Mike Edwards	IBM	Group Member
Simon Nash	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
Jeff Mischkinsky	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Vladislav Bezrukov	SAP AG*	Group Member
Sanjay Patil	SAP AG*	Group Member
Tai-Hsing Cha	TIBCO Software Inc.	Group Member

Contents

Resolutions

Resolution: 1. Minutes from meeting of 14th January 2008 approved.

Resolution: 2. Add Michael Rowley and remove Jeff Anderson from the list of editors

Resolution: 3. Remove the wsp elements from the choice content model of Qualifier and PolicySet and write in the accompanying documentation that these elements would commonly appear at this point.

Resolution: 4. Issue 18 is resolved by
a) remove the default qualifier attribute from intent maps
b) add an optional default qualifier to intent definitions which define qualified intents

Resolution: 5. Replace the existing syntax for defining qualified intents by the material defined in the Issue 24 material in JIRA

Resolution: 6. Issue 29 is resolved by adding wording at line 556 of the Specification, as described in these minutes.

Resolution: 7. Issue 31 is closed with no action

Resolution: 8. Issue 39 is resolved using the proposal contained in the JIRA for the issue, as amended in this meeting.

Actions

Action 20080124-01: Ashok to raise a new issue to provide a mechanism to provide configuration parameters for Policy Sets
Action 20080124-02: Ashok to prepare proper XSD version of the proposal for Issue 24
Action 20080124-03: Mike Edwards to log an issue on the subject of interaction intents vs implementation intents.
Action 20080124-04: Mike Edwards to create a formal issue and proposal based on the discussion of Message and Operation level intents

Agenda

1. Opening
2. Minutes approval
3. Additional editors
4. Testing Committee
5. Conformance Language
6. PolicySet attribute v. policySet element in SCDL
7. External Attachment (Issues 15, 23, 28) – I
8. External Attachment (Issues 15, 23, 28) - II
9. Default Qualifiers (Issue 18)
10. Structural form for qualified intents (Issue 24)

(Item 2) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC

Minutes from 14th January 2008 – approved unanimously.

Resolution: 1. Minutes from meeting of 14th January 2008 approved.

(Item 3) Additional Editors

Request for additional editors.

Motion from Ashok Malhotra, seconded by Mike Edwards, to add Michael Rowley to the list of editors and to remove Jeff Anderson. Approved unanimously.

Resolution: 2. Add Michael Rowley and remove Jeff Anderson from the list of editors

(Item 4) Conformance Language

Following from the decision on conformance language made by the Assembly TC:

The specification editors look to the WS-BPEL specification as a style to implement in this specification concerning labeling of normative text and conformance statements. Editors shall endeavor to number or otherwise identify these labeled sections so that they would remain steady across versions of the specification.

Decision is to wait for this version of the Assembly specification before proceeding with decision on the format of the Policy specification.

(Item 5) Testing Committee

A test committee is needed to a) write test assertions and b) work on writing test suite and associated materials.

There is an open request for volunteers to staff the testing committee.

(Item 6) PolicySet attribute v. policySet element in SCDL

(Ashok) Concern about the use of attributes is that they are not extensible. Whereas elements are extensible.
(Michael Rowley) It would look strange for a child element of (say) a reference to apply to its sibling elements.
(Ashok) The kind of use case is to allow for tuning or late "configuration" of a policy set.

(Michael R) This is a large increase in complexity. An alternative approach is to handle this through the proposed external attachment mechanism.
(Mike E) Consider that attributes are simpler to use than elements and that to make the simple cases harder in order to allow a complex usecase is not good. Prefer to use something like the proposed external attachment mechanism to handle these complex cases.

(Ashok) Recommend that we open this as an issue and look at it once the external attachment mechanism proceeds. Ashok will do this.
(Dale) WS Policy does allow for parameterized policies.

(Item 7) Policy Schema complex types for Qualifier and PolicySet

(Dale) Outlines the problem. The choice group of PolicySet has several elements from WS Policy namespace followed by an <any/> that could potentially also come from the WS Policy namespace. This means there is a UPA problem.

(Dale) Possible solution is to create an SCA <extension/> element to allow for placement of extension elements

(Michael R) Don't like that approach. Would prefer to have an <any/> on its own.

(Dave Booz) Suggest removing the wsp elements from the schema but leave their description in the text of the spec.
(Dale) Same problem exists for Qualifier complexType

Motion: Dale moves to remove the wsp elements from the choice content model of Qualifier and PolicySet and write in the accompanying documentation that these eleements would commonly appear at this point.
Seconded: Michael R
Accepted unanimously.

Resolution: 3. Remove the wsp elements from the choice content model of Qualifier and PolicySet and write in the accompanying documentation that these elements would commonly appear at this point.

(Item 8) External Attachment (Issues 15, 23, 28) – I

Issue 15

(Ashok) Outlines the proposal. Indicates that we are struggling with identifying the scope of the attachment. 3 usecases identified.
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200801/msg00025.html

Long debate took place about the model, with various alternative ways of describing the hierarchy of artifacts and how to apply external policies to them.

(Michael Rowley) Example XPath: /*/component/reference
- In the single infoset model, this returns references of domain-level components.
- In the multiple infoset model it returns references of every component.
Let's go with the single infoset model.

Proposed approach:
Step 1: Create a single infoset rooted at the logical Domain composite, and for each component which has implementation.composite, the infoset of the definition of the composite is appended as child elements recursively
Note: The infoset will also contain the result of deployment time processing (eg the targets of autowiring)
Step 2: The external attachment file(s) specify where within the infoset, Policies, PolicySets or Intents are applied using XPath expressions

Discussion of the problem of conflicts between 2 or more external attachments applying to the same element.

Summary statements about the discussions:
1) Keep existing "pull" mechanism, using PolicySets as they are today
2) Consider restricting the use of the policyset attribute to binding elements only
2a) Remove the "accumulation" of policysets from parent elements
3) External policy attachment mechanism will not attach intents
4) External policy attchement - subject is an XPath that runs against the (logical) Domain-wide infoset (as previously described)

(Item 9) Default Qualifiers (Issue 18)

Michael Rowley outlines the proposal contained in the issue.

Michael Rowley moves that:
a) to remove the default qualifier attribute from intent maps
b) to add the ability to add a default qualifier to intent definitions
No second - motion fails

Mike Edwards moves that
a) to remove the default qualifier attribute from intent maps
b) to add a mandatory default qualifier to intent definitions which define qualified intents
Michael Rowley seconds

Debate over the validity of the mandatory nature of the mandatory qualifier

Sanjay moves an amendment to change the word "mandatory" in b) to "optional"
Michael Rowley seconds
Amendment is accepted

Ashok proposes an amendment to remove a) from the motion
Anish seconds
Amendment fails

Motion now reads:
a) to remove the default qualifier attribute from intent maps
b) to add an optional default qualifier to intent definitions which define qualified intents
Motion accepted

Resolution: 4. Issue 18 is resolved by
a) remove the default qualifier attribute from intent maps
b) add an optional default qualifier to intent definitions which define qualified intents

Action 20080124-01: Ashok to raise a new issue to provide a mechanism to provide configuration parameters for Policy Sets

(Item 10)Structural form for qualified intents (Issue 24)

Ashok makes a motion to replace the existing syntax for defining qualified intents by the material defined in the Issue 24 material in JIRA
Sanjay seconds

Michael R would like the capability to define different qualifiers of an intent in different contributions, which is removed by this motion.

Dave B notes that this is an incompatible change

Mike E moves to amend the motion to leave the existing mechanism as is and simply add the new capability as an extra method.
Vladislav seconds
Amendment fails

Main motion - 5 in favour 2 against

Motion passes

Resolution: 5. Replace the existing syntax for defining qualified intents by the material defined in the Issue 24 material in JIRA

Action 20080124-02: Ashok to prepare proper XSD version of the proposal for Issue 24

(Item 11) Need more Precision on when Policies in a policy set are in effect

Ashok recaps the background of the issue.

Michael R moves to close the issue with no action
Mike Edwards seconds

Michael R moves an amendment - to limit PolicySets to have at most one top-level intent map
Sanjay seconds

This is proposed as a motion to replace the original motion
3 in favour, 5 against
Motion to replace fails

Vote on the original motion:
Defeated unanimously – motion fails

Edwards moves to resolve Issue 29 by adding the following words into the specification at line 556:
"When a PolicySet is applied to a particular element, the policies used from the policy set include any standalone polices plus the policies from each intent map contained in the PolicySet as described below."
Sanjay seconds
Motion passes unanimously

Resolution: 6. Issue 29 is resolved by adding wording at line 556 of the Specification, as described in these minutes.

(Item 12) Issue 31: Is it possible to use only a piece of a more general policy set?

Ashok moves to close Issue 31 with no action
Sanjay seconds
Accepted unanimously

Resolution: 7. Issue 31 is closed with no action

(Item 13) Issue 39: Need Support for Mutually Exclusive Intents

Mike Edwards moves to accept the proposal as defined in the Issue in JIRA
Sanjay seconds

Michael R moves an amendment that qualifiable intents should have a new attribute called @mutuallyexclusive which is a boolean with a default value of false and which applies to all of the qualifiers under that intent
Mike Edwards seconds
Amendment passes

Ashok moves an amendment that the proposal must be synchronized with the syntax approved as the resolution of issue 24
Michael R seconds
Amendment passes unanimously

Martin moves an amendment that this proposal is placed into section 3.1`of the spec
Michael R seconds
Amendment passes unanimously

Motion passes unanimously

Resolution: 8. Issue 39 is resolved using the proposal contained in the JIRA for the issue, as amended in this meeting.

(Item 14) Discussion of Interaction Intents vs Implementation Intents

Michael R outlines the matter.
Michael R insists on the need for parameterization of implementation intents (or their equivalent in any future proposal) eg authorization
Conclusion of discussion.

Action 20080124-03: Mike Edwards to log an issue on the subject of interaction intents vs implementation intents.

(Item 15) Issue 33: The ability to express capabilities via intents

Dave B outlines the problem.
Issue 33 was discussed. The question is first what are the usecases implied for this function. The idea is that in effect, any service which has a ***capability*** is like having the service present with 2 bindings – one with an intent applied (eg encryption) and one without that intent applied, allowing two kinds of client – one kind that needs encryption and one that does not.

The second question is how such capabilities are marked and how the markings on the services and on related policy sets are interpreted.

The group decided to table discussion.

(Item 16) Discussion of Operation Level Intents

At this point, several members of the TC had to leave, informal discussion continued on operation level intents, with no binding decisions.

There was a long discussion of a proposal to allow both operation and message level intents through the annotation of interface definition artifacts (eg WSDLs and Java interfaces) and how such annotation is pulled into the calculation of the policy set(s) to be applied. The thinking is that in principle individual operations and/or individual messages would get their own set of policy sets applied that could be different to those applied to the rest of the interface. An example is specific encryption for just specific message types, while no encryption is applied to the rest of the interface.

One of the principles discussed is NOT having any SCDL marking of either operations or of messages – it is regarded as over-complex and this would in effect create a kind of SCA interface description language in parallel with the existing ones, which is not thought at all desirable.

Michael Rowley: For message and operation level intents...

Run the (current) algorithm multiple times for each binding in the composite file, once for each message of each operation in the interface. The list of intents for each iteration

will be the existing list of required intents, PLUS any intents specified on the operation and/or message of the current interation. The @appliesTo XPath expression, as before, runs with a context node that is the parent of the binding (service or reference), but also has iteration variables of $operation and $message, which are the WSDL port type elements for the current operation and message.

Action 20080124-04: Mike Edwards to create a formal issue and proposal based on the discussion of Message and Operation level intents

AOB

Decision: Meeting on Monday 28th January is cancelled.

Next meeting 4th Februrary 2008
Close of Business