

***DRAFT******SCA-Policy TC Teleconference******27 October 2008******Chair***

Dave Booz

***Scribe***

Mike Edwards

***Attendees***

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Status</b>
Fred Carter	AmberPoint	Group Member
Dale Moberg	Axway Software*	Group Member
Tom Rutt	Fujitsu Limited*	Group Member
Robert Freund	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
Michael Beisiegel	IBM	Group Member
David Booz	IBM	Group Member
Mike Edwards	IBM	Group Member
Simon Holdsworth	IBM	Group Member
Anish Karmarkar	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Rich Levinson	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Sanjay Patil	SAP AG*	Group Member
Plamen Pavlov	SAP AG*	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 5) TC Logistics .....	4
(Item 6) Action Items .....	4
(Item 7) New Issues .....	5
(Item 8) Existing Issues .....	5
ISSUE 59: Limit policySet attachment to bindings .....	5
Issue Status Reporting - for Liaison Committee .....	6
AOB .....	6

## **Resolutions**

**Resolution: Meeting minutes of TC F2F meeting of 20<sup>th</sup> October 2008 accepted.**

**Resolution: TC meeting of Nov 10<sup>th</sup> is cancelled**

**Resolution: Issue 59 is resolved according to the directional statement contained in the minutes of 27<sup>th</sup> October 2008.**

## **Actions**

None

## **Agenda**

1. Roll call

2. Confirm minute taker, Mike Edwards

3. Agenda bashing

4. Meeting Minutes

Vote to accept minutes from Oct 20, 2008 meeting

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00039.html>

5. TC Logistics:

a. Recording issue status - 10 Open

b. Cancel Nov 10 meeting due to SCA-J F2F?

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.

DONE

- c. 20081002-02: (Rich L and Ashok) - Prepare a detailed proposal for a resolution of issue 57 (Target Nov 10)
  - d. 20081002-04: (Ashok) To prepare a full proposal for Issue 32 for an intent which conveys the need for mutual authentication (Target Nov 10)
  - e. 20081002-06: (Ashok) to prepare the specification wording for Issue 46 resolution, plus an updated XSD (Target Nov 10)
- DONE by DaveB

## 7. New Issues

None

## 8. Issue Discussion

- a. ISSUE 59 (Sanjay and Anish): 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>

- b. ISSUE-60 (Mike E): Clarify scope of ordered intent  
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-60>

Proposal:

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00025.html>

- c. ISSUE-61 (Mike E): How are mayProvides intents on bindings satisfied  
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-61>

Proposal:

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00032.html>

- d. ISSUE-54 (Dave B): Wire validation rules have changed  
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-54>

Proposal:

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200810/msg00028.html>

- e. 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>

f. ISSUE-35: Define Conformance Target  
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-35>

g. ISSUE-48: Transaction defaults are not optimal  
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-48>

h. ISSUE-33: Capabilities  
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-33>  
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 roll

### ***(Item 3) Agenda Bashing***

No changes

### ***(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC***

Vote to accept minutes from Oct 20th, 2008 meeting

**Resolution: Meeting minutes of TC F2F meeting of 20<sup>th</sup> October 2008 accepted.**

### ***(Item 5) TC Logistics***

Meeting of November 10<sup>th</sup> is cancelled (SCA Java TC F2F that week)

**Resolution: TC meeting of Nov 10<sup>th</sup> is cancelled**

### ***(Item 6) Action Items***

- a. Dave Booz to provide proposal for issue 33  
Outstanding
- b. 20081002-01: (Mike E) Inform the Assembly TC of removal of element.  
DONE
- c. 20081002-02: (Rich L and Ashok) - Prepare a detailed proposal for a resolution of issue 57 (Target Nov 10)

Outstanding

d. 20081002-04: (Ashok) To prepare a full proposal for Issue 32 for an intent which conveys the need for mutual authentication (Target Nov 10)

Outstanding

e. 20081002-06: (Ashok) to prepare the specification wording for Issue 46 resolution, plus an updated XSD (Target Nov 10)

DONE

### ***(Item 7) New Issues***

None

### ***(Item 8) Existing Issues***

#### **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>

Sanjay outlines the proposal in the slides

Mike E makes points that inline attachment can be useful a) in simple cases and b) during development & test

Mike E: I can live with the idea that either A) external attachment completely overrides direct attachment (eg a domain wide setting) B) Where external attachment picks out some given set of SCDL element, then it replaces any inline policySets for those element(s)

<Discussion of the ideas of flags on the composites, vs a setting on the Domain level as options>

Anish: i have given this some thought and there is a tradeoff involved between complexity and feature. I'm no longer sure what is a good compromise point between the two.

Anish Q: can policy sets exists on their own (outside of a composite) in a contribution?

Dave Booz: Anish, yes

<Discussion of the effect of removing inline attachment completely - and the effect this has on the development process>

Dave Booz I like the idea of EPA always overrides IPA and IPA is optional for compliance

Murty: I agree with idea of EPA always overrides IPA and IPA is optional for compliance. This gives every implementation the required flexibility.

Anish there may be good reasons for saying that EPA is optional for compliance too  
Anish which would take us to both IPA and EPA is optional

Sanjay: EPA and IPA mechanisms are optional for implementations to support with the assumption that at least one of them would be supported by any runtime. When both EPA and IPA are used, the policy sets applicable via EPA to a SCDL element override any inline policies attached to that element.

Motion for direction for resolution of Issue 59 - by Sanjay - using the wording in paragraph above

Plamen seconds

Anish - what happens if a runtime does not support IPA, for example?

Sanjay - it would be ignored- any inline PolicySets would be ignored

Motion is passed without objection

**Resolution: Issue 59 is resolved according to the directional statement contained in the minutes of 27<sup>th</sup> October 2008.**

### ***Issue Status Reporting - for Liaison Committee***

10 open issues

0 opened today

1 closed today

### ***AOB***

Next meeting 3<sup>rd</sup> Nov

Close of Business