

FINAL**SCA-Policy TC F2F Meeting****02/03 October 2008****Chair**

Dave Booz, Ashok Malhotra

Scribe

Mike Edwards

Attendees

Name	Company	Status
Dale Moberg	Axway Software*	Group Member
Robert Freund	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
Eisaku Nishiyama	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
Eric Wells	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
David Booz	IBM	Group Member
Mike Edwards	IBM	Group Member
Martin Chapman	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Anish Karmarkar	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Ashok Malhotra	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Sanjay Patil	SAP AG*	Group Member
Plamen Pavlov	SAP AG*	Group Member
Fabian Ritzmann	Sun Microsystems	Group Member

Contents

Resolutions.....	2
Actions	3
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	5
(Item 8) Existing Issues	5
Issue 15: External Policy Attachment.....	5
Issue 23 - Policy Attachment at the Message Level	6
Issue 25 - XPath Expressions for intent/@constrains	6
Issue 28 - Add the ability to attach policy directly to an SCA composite	6
Issue 42 - Infoset for policySet @appliesTo.....	7
Issue 58 - Remove <operation/> elements from the specification.....	7
Issue 49: Handling of Implementation Intents in the Implementation Hierarchy is not described	7
Issue 57 - Fine grained Authorization Intent	8
Issue 21 - alwaysProvides in binding specs	10
Issue 56 - Intents which conflict with Binding configuration.....	10
Issue 11 - Binding Config relationship to policySet.....	10
Issue 20 - Should intents have a default policySet	11
AOB	13

Resolutions

- Resolution: Meeting minutes of TC meeting of 22nd September 2008 accepted.**
- Resolution: Issue 15 is resolved using the text in sca-policy-1[1].1-spec-wd-07_Issue_15.doc as amended by the text in SCA Policy WD -- changes for issue 15V2.doc**
- Resolution: Issue 23 is closed with no action.**
- Resolution: Issue 25 is closed with no action.**
- Resolution: Issue 28 is closed with no action**
- Resolution: Issue 42 is resolved using the text identified in the minutes.**
- Resolution: Issue 58 is resolved by removing the <operation/> element from the specification**
- Resolution: Issue 21 is closed with no action**
- Resolution: Issue 56 is resolved with the text in the minutes.**

Resolution: Issue 11 is closed with no action.
Resolution: Issue 22 is resolved by removing lines 1952 - 1956 from WD-07 of the Policy specification
Resolution: Issue 36 is closed with no action.
Resolution: Issue 46 should be resolved according to the direction laid out in the minutes.

Actions

Action 20081002-01: (Mike E) Inform the Assembly TC of this decision

Action 20081002-02: Rich L and Ashok - Prepare a detailed proposal for a resolution of this issue.

Action 20081002-03: (Ashok) Need to raise an issue to clarify how the "mayProvides" intents on a bindingType are satisfied

Action 20081002-04: (Ashok) To prepare a full proposal for Issue 32 for an intent which conveys the need for mutual authentication

Action 20081002-05: (Dave B) Prepare the proposal that will resolve Issue 54

Action 20081002-06: (Ashok) to prepare the specification wording for the resolution, plus an updated XSD

Agenda

1. Roll call

2. Confirm minute taker, Mike Edwards

3. Agenda bashing

4. Meeting Minutes

Vote to accept minutes from Sept 22, 2008 meeting

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00000.html>

5. TC Logistics:

a. Election of an issues editor

b. LOA for Martin Chapman from Oct6-Oct19 2008

6. ACTION ITEMS

a. Sanjay to write a proposal for issue 49 based on using External Attachment.

b. Ashok to provide non-normative text to close issue 53

DONE - <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200809/msg00036.html>

c. Dave Booz to provide proposal for issue 33

7. New Issues

None

8. Main Agenda Body

October 2

9:00-9:15 Administrivia and kickoff

9:15-10:30 Issue 15 - External Policy Attachment

10:30-10:45 Break

10:45-12:00 Issues 23, 25, 28, 42, 58

12:00-1:00 Lunch

1:00-1:30 Issue 49

1:30-2:30 Issue 57

2:30-2:45 Break

2:45-3:30 Issue 21,56 (and possibly 11)

3:30-3:45 Issue 20

3:45-4:00 Issue 32

4:00-5:00 Issue 44

October 3

9:00-9:30 Issue 22/36

9:30-10:30 Issue 54

10:30-10:45 Break

10:45-11:15 Issue 46

11:15-12:00 Issue 53

12:00-1:00 Lunch

1:00-2:00 Testing

2:00-3:00 Issue 48

3:00-4:00 Issue 60

9. AOB

(Item 3) Agenda Bashing

(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC

Vote to accept minutes from Sept 22nd, 2008 meeting

**Resolution: Meeting minutes of TC meeting of 22nd
September 2008 accepted.**

(Item 5) TC Logistics

(Item 6) Action Items

(Item 7) New Issues

(Item 8) Existing Issues

Issue 15: External Policy Attachment

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200809/msg00037.html>

Examining Ashok's responses to the Issue 15 proposal - with an updated proposal in the email above = SCA Policy WD -- changes for issue 15.doc

Debate over the material relating to <definitions/> in "4.3 External Attachment of PolicySets Mechanism" section

- question of the model by which things like PolicySets become part of the domain (logical contribution to the definitions.xml structure)

All the changes are concentrated into Section 4.3 of Ashok's document

Ashok describes 2 issues that will be needed in the Assembly TC in relation to the resolution of Issue 15:

- extensibility element for the <definitions/> structure

- API for adding/modifying contents of the global <definitions/> structure

Also one issue to be raised in the Policy TC:

- whether <policyReference/> element should have a URI rather than simply a QName

Move to resolve Issue 15 using the text in sca-policy-1[1].1-spec-wd-07_Issue_15.doc as amended by the text in SCA Policy WD -- changes for issue 15V2.doc

Moved by Ashok, seconded by Mike E

Accepted unanimously

Resolution: **Issue 15 is resolved using the text in sca-policy-1[1].1-spec-wd-07_Issue_15.doc as amended by the text in SCA Policy WD -- changes for issue 15V2.doc**

Issue 23 - Policy Attachment at the Message Level

Ashok Moves to close Issue 23 with no action

(due to the function provided by Issue 15, now resolved)

Seconded by Bob

Accepted unanimously

Resolution: **Issue 23 is closed with no action.**

Issue 25 - XPath Expressions for intent/@constrains

Mike E moves to close Issue 25 with no action

Ashok seconds

Accepted unanimously.

Resolution: **Issue 25 is closed with no action.**

Issue 28 - Add the ability to attach policy directly to an SCA composite

Mike E moves to close Issue 28 with no action

Plamen seconds

Motion passes 6 in favour, 3 against.

Resolution: **Issue 28 is closed with no action**

Issue 42 - InfoSet for policySet @appliesTo

Ashok explains that there is an InfoSet description contained in the resolution of Issue 15

Resolution text:

"The @appliesTo attribute uses the "InfoSet for External Attachment" as described in Section 4.3.1 ("The Form of the @attachTo Attribute")" to be added after line 355 in the sca-policy-1[1].1-spec-wd-07_Issue_15.doc version of the specification.

Ashok moves to resolve issue 42 using the resolution text above
Mike E seconds

Accepted unanimously.

Resolution: Issue 42 is resolved using the text identified in the minutes.

Issue 58 - Remove <operation/> elements from the specification

Ashok moves to resolve issue 58 by accepting the proposal to remove the <operation/> element from the specification.
Anish seconds

Accepted unanimously.

Resolution: Issue 58 is resolved by removing the <operation/> element from the specification

Action 20081002-01: (Mike E) Inform the Assembly TC of this decision

Issue 49: Handling of Implementation Intents in the Implementation Hierarchy is not described

Resolution proposal here:
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00006.html>

Sanjay outlines the proposal

Ashok questions how "RunAs" would work
(Sanjay) - it's policy based and so does not fall under this issue

Ashok asks about Transaction Policy - if the component using the Composite is marked as Transactional, doesn't the intent flow down to the nested components?

(Sanjay) there might be a lot of complexity here, since you can't control the way in which an intent would "flow down"

Mike E makes the point about "element of surprise" when building a composite with a set of components - where they are atomic, any implementation intents applied to a component would apply, but where the components are implemented by a "lower level" composite, then such component intents are not applied

Mike E also notes that we currently allow implementation intents to be attached to <composite/> elements which do get pushed down to the structurally contained components in that composite
- this is also a surprising difference

Sanjay responds by pointing out that there is a bigger complexity issue that in using a nested composite, the developer needs to be aware of the behaviour of the lower level composite in detail.

Ashok thinks that in particular for transactional intents, it should be possible to push down the intent from the higher level - otherwise you are already in big trouble

Mike E makes a point that one way to handle the situation would be to have (one or more) implementation intents expressed on the lower level composite which indicate potentially negative things (eg "I can't take place in a transaction") which might then clash with an intent on the using component - the conflict would be regarded as an error

<Further discussion of the usecases involving implementation intents and their use in the case of components composed into composites>

Issue 57 - Fine grained Authorization Intent

Rich Levinson email:

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00010.html>

> presentation in file "fine-grain-authorization-intents.ppt" attached to above email

Rich describes the use case.

Dale: Does this presentation actually call for any new functional capabilities within the SCA specifications?

- What are you looking for?

Rich: Require eg the Authorization section of the spec to identify fine-grained authorization as a capability

Dave: Wouldn't this capability be provided by the component container? Doesn't the current role based authorization material cover this requirement?

Rich: No, the role based stuff does not deal with controlling access to individual application capabilities.

Dave B: SCA does not describe resources, so how do we relate the fine grained control to actual resources?

Rich: SCA Policy is supposed to be saying "what capabilities do we need of the service provider runtime in order to access specific external services" - so it should cover this.
- authorization is required, but it is of the "fine grained" variety

Dave B: Where is the policy - in a Policy Set?

Rich: Yes, in a policy set.

Dave B: Is it attached to a component?

Rich: Yes, it is attached to a component, but it is used by the "external provider" for the authorization

Rich: The policySet would require to be administrated - dynamically modified as necessary

Dave B: I understand that the PolicySet would have a separate lifecycle from the component to which it is attached. But what other need is there than to attach the fine grained PolicySet to a component?

Mike E: Think that there is enough mechanics in SCA today - add a "FINE_GRAINED_AUTHORIZATION" intent, create one or more PolicySets which satisfy those intents and to attach those PolicySets to the relevant component(s) using the external attachment mechanism as defined through Issue 15

Rich: Look at JSR 115, for example

Dave B: As long as this intent does not specifically imply JSR 115 format (etc) then it does fit into the SCA framework, I think

Rich: I think I agree

Ashok: Should we remove the current Authorization material from the specs and instead have XACML, JSR 115 and others as examples of how it might be done.

ie INTENT -> PolicySet, with PolicySet in whichever language is relevant (XACML, JSR 115 etc)

- need to modify the spec to say this

<Debate on the details of a possible proposal>

(Ashok) Need to think through what intents are required and what specific Policy mechanisms we need to describe.

- Affects 7.3 section in the Policy Specification

Action 20081002-02: Rich L and Ashok - Prepare a detailed proposal for a resolution of this issue.

Issue 21 - alwaysProvides in binding specs

<Discussion of the cases where mayProvides would be used>

Dave B moves to close Issue 21 with no action

Mike E seconds

Accepted unanimously

Resolution: Issue 21 is closed with no action

Action 20081002-03: (Ashok) Need to raise an issue to clarify how the "mayProvides" intents on a bindingType are satisfied

Issue 56 - Intents which conflict with Binding configuration

Dave Booz proposed resolution is in:

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200809/msg00042.html>

Anish: for the 2nd sentence: "If the configured instance of a binding is in conflict with the intents and policy sets selected for that instance, the SCA runtime MUST raise an error."

Anish moves to resolve issue 56 with the following text following line 200 in WD-07 of the specification:

"If the configured instance of a binding is in conflict with the intents and policy sets selected for that instance, the SCA runtime MUST raise an error. For example, a web service binding which requires the SOAP intent but which points to a WSDL binding that does not specify SOAP."

Plamen seconds

Accepted unanimously

Resolution: Issue 56 is resolved with the text in the minutes.

Issue 11 - Binding Config relationship to policySet

Anish moves to close Issue 11 with no action

Plamen seconds

Accepted unanimously

Resolution: Issue 11 is closed with no action.

Issue 20 - Should intents have a default policySet

Mike E moves to close Issue 11 with no action (as it conflicts with Issue 15 resolution)
Dale seconds

Accepted unanimously

Resolution: Issue 20 is closed with no action.

Issue 32 Security intent which allows a client to authenticate a server

<Debate about the functionality implied>

Action 20081002-04: (Ashok) To prepare a full proposal for Issue 32 for an intent which conveys the need for mutual authentication

- Close of business for October 2nd -
- Reopening of the meeting on October 3rd -

Issue 22 - Profile Intent extension - provides other intents

Ashok outlines the thinking behind the Issue (WS-I)
<Discussion of possible approaches to intents for WS-I Basic Profile>

Mike E moves to resolve Issue 22 by removing lines 1952 - 1956 from WD-07.
Dale seconds

Accepted unanimously

Resolution: Issue 22 is resolved by removing lines 1952 - 1956 from WD-07 of the Policy specification

Action 20081002-04: (Dave B) Inform the Bindings TC of this decision.

Issue 36 - Add Intents for all existing WS-I Profiles

Mike Edwards moves to close Issue 36 with no action
Plamen seconds

Accepted unanimously

Resolution: Issue 36 is closed with no action.

Issue 54 - Wire validation rules have changed

Dave B explains the origins of the issue in Assembly Issue 57
<Discussion of the general direction for the resolution>

Action 20081002-05: (Dave B) Prepare the proposal that will resolve Issue 54

Issue 46 - How to configure PolicySets

Ashok explains the need for an extensible way of attaching Policy Sets - needs a child element rather than an attribute

Mike E argues against using <requires/> child elements (no use case for extensibility of intents)

Mike E argues for retaining the existing @policySet attribute

Ashok moves that we agree on a direction for the resolution of Issue 46 so that policySets can be specified EITHER in the way currently described in the specification (@policySet attribute) OR through a new mechanism of using a child <policySet/> element where these child elements are optionally available for all elements that today have the @policySet attribute

Mike E seconds

Accepted unanimously

Resolution: Issue 46 should be resolved according to the direction laid out in the minutes.

Action 20081002-06: (Ashok) to prepare the specification wording for the resolution, plus an updated XSD

(coordinate with Dieter who is reworking the XSDs for a similar global change caused by an Assembly TC resolution)

Issue 53 - How do we tell what a policySet @provides?

Ashok provided a proposal for this issue in the following email:
<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200809/msg00036.html>
which contains a document:
Suggested Wording for Issue 53.doc

Mike E: Amended text
Suggested Wording for Issue 53

When writing policySets, care should be taken to ensure that the policies contained in the policySet always satisfy the intents included in the @provides attribute. Specifically, when using WS-Policy [ref] the optional attribute and the exactlyOne operator should be used with care as these can result in alternative policies and uncertainty as to whether a particular alternative satisfies the advertised intents.

If the WS-Policy attribute optional = true is attached to a policy assertion, it leads to two policy alternatives, one that includes and one that does not include the assertion. During wire validation it is impossible to predict which of the two alternatives will be selected - if the absence of the policy assertion does not satisfy the intent, then it is possible that the intent is not actually satisfied when the policySet is used.

Similarly, if the WS-Policy operator exactlyOne is used, only one of the set of policy assertions within the operator is actually used at runtime. If the set of assertions is intended to satisfy one or more intents, it is vital to ensure that each policy assertion in the set actually satisfies the intent(s).

It should also be noted that the section on Wire Validity specifies that the strict version of the WS-Policy intersection algorithm is used to establish wire validity and determine the policies to be used. The strict version of policy intersection algorithm ignores the ignorable attribute on assertions. This means that the ignorable facility of WS-Policy cannot be used in policySets.

Mike E moves to accept the amended version of the proposed text as the resolution of Issue 53
Seconded Ashok

Accepted unanimously

Resolution: Issue 53 is resolved using the text agreed as recorded in the minutes.

AOB

Next meeting Oct 13th
Close of Business