

FINAL**SCA-Policy TC Teleconference****13 October 2008****Chair**

Dave Booz, Ashok Malhotra

Scribe

Mike Edwards

Attendees

Name	Company	Status
Fred Carter	AmberPoint	Group Member
Robert Freund	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
Anish Karmarkar	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Rich Levinson	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Fabian Ritzmann	Sun Microsystems	Group Member
Tai-Hsing Cha	TIBCO Software Inc.	Group Member
Murty Gurajada	TIBCO Software Inc.	Group Member
Pundalik Kudapkar	TIBCO Software Inc.	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 6) Action Items	4
(Item 7) New Issues	5
(Item 8) Existing Issues	5
ISSUE 49: Handling of Implementation Intents in the Implementation Hierarchy is not described	5
ISSUE-60: Clarify scope of ordered intent	6
Issue Status Reporting - for Liaison Committee	6
AOB	7

Resolutions

Resolution: Meeting minutes of TC F2F meeting of 2/3rd October 2008 accepted.

Resolution: Issue 61 is opened.

Actions

None

Agenda

1. Roll call

2. Confirm minute taker, Mike Edwards

3. Agenda bashing

4. Meeting Minutes

Vote to accept minutes from Oct 2-3, 2008 meeting

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00013.html>

5. TC Logistics:

a. Election of an issues editor

6. ACTION ITEMS

a. Dave Booz to provide proposal for issue 33

b. 20081002-01: (Mike E) Inform the Assembly TC of removal of element.

c. 20081002-02: (Rich L and Ashok) - Prepare a detailed proposal for a resolution of issue 57.

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

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

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

g. 20081002-06: (Ashok) to prepare the specification wording for Issue 46 resolution, plus an updated XSD

7. New Issues

a. ISSUE-61: How are mayProvide intents on bindings satisfied

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-61>

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00018.html>

8. Issue Discussion

a. ISSUE 49: Handling of Implementation Intents in the Implementation Hierarchy is not described

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-49>

Original Proposal:

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

b. ISSUE 59: Limit policySet attachment to bindings

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-59>

Discussion:

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200809/msg00028.html>

Original Proposal:

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200808/msg00012.html>

c. ISSUE 57: Fine grain authorization intent

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

Original Proposal:

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

d. ISSUE-60: Clarify scope of ordered intent

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-60>

e. ISSUE-35: Define Conformance Target

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-35>

f. ISSUE-48: Transaction defaults are not optimal

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-48>

g. ISSUE-33: Capabilities

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

proposal:

h. ISSUE-54: Wire validation rules have changed

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-54>

proposal:

i. ISSUE-32: Security intent which allows a client to authenticate a server

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-32>

proposal:

j. ISSUE-44: Need a clear way to distinguish Implementation Intents from Interaction Intents

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-44>

proposal: waiting to see if we need it

9. AOB

a. straggler role

(Item 3) Agenda Bashing

No changes

(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC

Vote to accept minutes from Sept 15th, 2008 meeting

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00013.html>

**Resolution: Meeting minutes of TC F2F meeting of 2/3rd
October 2008 accepted.**

(Item 6) Action Items

a. Dave Booz to provide proposal for issue 33

b. 20081002-01: outstanding (Mike E) Inform the Assembly TC of removal of operation element.

c. 20081002-02: outstanding (Rich L and Ashok) - Prepare a detailed proposal for a resolution of issue 57.

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

- e. 20081002-04: outstanding (Ashok) To prepare a full proposal for Issue 32 for an intent which conveys the need for mutual authentication
- f. 20081002-05: outstanding (Dave B) Prepare the proposal that will resolve Issue 54
- g. 20081002-06: outstanding (Ashok) to prepare the specification wording for Issue 46 resolution, plus an updated XSD

Item c) must wait for Ashok to return from vacation/business travel - outlook 3 weeks

(Item 7) New Issues

Currently 9 open issues.

ISSUE-61: How are mayProvide intents on bindings satisfied

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-61>

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00018.html>

Dave B describes the issue - follows from F2F discussion

Anish moves to open Issue 61

Mike E seconds

Requires a 2/3 majority of TC voting members to pass. There are > 2/3 voting members present on the call.

Accepted unanimously

Resolution: Issue 61 is opened.

(Item 8) Existing Issues

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

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-49>

Original Proposal:

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

Discussion between Anish and Mike, comparing an intent on <composite/> element with the same intent expressed on a <component/> element that uses the same composite as its implementation

(is this the same or is it different)

<discussion of the alternatives>

(Anish) Question - is the current proposal saying that the component intent is ignored, or that it is an error to apply such an intent?

EricW: Did we decide how to handle components at the same level that "contradict"? I.E. One trans and one non-trans.

EricW: If we had a rule to ensure components at the same level were consistent might this solve the problem? +1 to Mikes unmarked intents

EricW: We should make it clear that not marking a componet is EXPLICITLY saying "DON'T CARE"

Mike E - seems that there is a level of inconsistency in the way that atomic implementations are treated in comparison with composite implementations. If an atomic implementation says nothing, any policy may be applied to it. Why treat composite implementations differently? If the composite can't handle something, it can (and should) be marked accordingly with intents

ISSUE-60: Clarify scope of ordered intent

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-60>

Dave B describes the issue

Anish: agree with the proposal: no need for total global order

Mike E - surely the proposed resolution is the right one - ie ordered intent only applies to one individual wire between one reference and one service

Mike E moves to resolve Issue 60 using the proposal contained in the JIRA
Bob seconds

Dave Booz:

1980 3) ordered The binding implementation guarantees that the messages are delivered
1981 to the service implementation in the order in which they were sent by the service
1982 consumer. This intent does not guarantee that messages that are sent by a service
1983 consumer are delivered to the service implementation.

1984

1985 The binding implementation guarantees that the messages are delivered to the
1986 service consumer in the order in which they were sent by the service
1987 implementation. This intent does not guarantee that messages that are sent by the
1988 service implementation are delivered to the service consumer.

Anish: can we just talk about 'sender' and 'receiver'?, instead of reference/callback but fine with letting editors deal with this

Motion lapses due to time.

Consider further on the email list.

Issue Status Reporting - for Liaison Committee

9 open issues

1 opened today
0 closed today

AOB

Next meeting 20th Oct
Close of Business