

DRAFT***SCA-Policy TC Teleconference******19 May 2008******Chair***

Dave Booz, Ashok Malhotra

Scribe

Mike Edwards

Attendees

Name	Company	Status
fred carter	AmberPoint	Group Member
Dale Moberg	Axway Software*	Group Member
Michael Rowley	BEA Systems, Inc.	Group Member
Jacques Durand	Fujitsu Limited*	Group Member
Tom Rutt	Fujitsu Limited*	Group Member
Robert Freund	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
Eisaku Nishiyama	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
Rich Levinson	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Vladislav Bezrukov	SAP AG*	Group Member
Sanjay Patil	SAP AG*	Group Member
Fabian Ritzmann	Sun Microsystems	Group Member
Tai-Hsing Cha	TIBCO Software Inc.	Group Member

Murty Gurajada
Pundalik Kudapkar

TIBCO Software Inc.
TIBCO Software Inc.

Group Member
Group Member

Contents

Resolutions.....	2
Actions	2
Agenda	2
(Item 3) Agenda Bashing	4
(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC	4
(Item 5) F2F Logistics	4
(Item 6) Action Items.....	4
(Item 7) New Issues	4
ISSUE 53: How do we tell what a policySet @provides?	4
ISSUE 54: Wire validation rules have changed.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
ISSUE 55: Clarify the handling of intents	Error! Bookmark not defined.
(Item 8) Existing Issues	5
Issue 43: Use of intents from component type in policySet algorithm.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Issue 15: External Policy Attachement	5
ISSUE 52: Policy algorithm gets required intents from what interfaces definitions/declarations?	Error! Bookmark not defined.
AOB	6

Resolutions

Actions

Agenda

1. Roll call

2. Appointment of minute taker: Mike Edwards

3. Agenda bashing

4. Vote to accept minutes from May 12, 2008 meeting

<http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/sca-policy/download.php/28263/SCA%20Policy%20minutes%202008-05-12.pdf>

5. TC Logistics: any questions about TC telecons or f2f?
No telcons May 26, June 2

6. ACTION ITEMS

a. Action 20080421-01: (Ashok, Mike E) Produce writeups of section 4.10 based on the 2 different approaches to push vs pull mechanisms in response to Issue 15

Done:

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200804/msg00054.html>

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

This may be moot. See below.

b. Action 2008-05-05-02: Malhotra to add to the write-up of the relationship between pull and push models, that one just adds in the policy sets and does so after step A of section 4.10.

Done: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200805/msg00025.html>

c. Action 2008-05-05-03: Malhotra: Take the domain info set write-up and show how it should be merged with the policySet selection algorithm (4.10).

Done: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200805/msg00025.html>

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

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

7. New Issues

a. Issue 56: Intents conflicting with binding configuration

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200805/msg00027.html>

8. Issues

a. 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>

b. Issue 15 External Policy Attachment.

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

c. ISSUE 52: Policy algorithm gets required intents from what interfaces definitions/declarations?

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-52>

d. 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>

e. Issue 33: The ability to express capabilities via intents.

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

f. 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>

g. 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>

9. AOB

10. Any additions to the roll?

(Item 3) Agenda Bashing

No changes

(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC

Minutes of TC meeting of 12th May

Resolution: Minutes of TC meeting of 12th May are accepted

(Item 5) F2F Logistics

No telecons on May 26, June 2

(Item 6) Action Items

- a. Action 20080421-01: DONE (email sent to list)
- b. Action 2008-05-05-02: DONE
- c. Action 2008-05-05-03: DONE
- d. Action 2008-05-12-01: DONE
- e. Action 2008-05-12-02: Outstanding (Mike Edwards & Michael Rowley)

(Item 7) New Issues

ISSUE 56: Intents conflicting with binding configuration

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-56>

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200805/msg00027.html>

Dave B summarizes - the issue flows from a Bindings TC decision

Michael R moves to open the issue

Mike Edwards seconds

Agreed unanimously

Resolution: Issue 56 moved to Open state

(Item 8) Existing Issues

Issue 15: External Policy Attachment

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

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

Mike Edwards outlines his proposal, as contained in email 029 above

Michael R: Removing the "pull" mechanism may well remove one of the simple usecases

- The XPath expression is probably way too complex without the use of XPath functions, for the external attachment
- So, for me the SCA provided XPath functions are the key - what they look like and how they are used

Michael R: With external attachment - should be possible to have overriding - "later" application of a Policy Set can override an earlier one - very hard to create "disjoint" attachment rules

- better to have general ones which are then overrrdden by more specific ones
- this affects rule G

Mike E: Problem with that is how the overriding works - what overrides what - how is it determined?

Michael R: This should be determined by the intents which are satisfied by the Policy Set

Dave B: Not clear that this works well if PolicySets satisfy more than one Intent

Michael R: The idea is that if first policy set satisfies A, B, C and later policy set satisfies A alone, then the first policy set is dropped and something else must satisfy B and C

Michael R: There is also a problem with the use of the external attachment - it should be possible to externally attach PolicySets to ancestor elements and then have them inherited

Michael R: Also, the external attachment mechanism algorithm needs to be merged with the infoaset algorithm

Michael R: Where we're heading with this, I think:

- big infoaset is constructed where one step is applying externally applied PolicySets eg Step A3 talks about the ancestor elements

currently ancestor elements go as far as the <composite/> element and no more but the big infoaset could have a lot more ancestor elements

Michael R: Can I discuss the ability to attach intents externally

- configuration of some bindings and some policy sets can be done entirely by using intents

for intents used this way, it DOES make sense to be able to specify those from outside the composite

AOB

Next meeting F2F meeting, early June.
Close of Business