

**DRAFT****SCA-Policy TC Teleconference****11 May 2009****Chairs**

Dave Booz, Ashok Malhotra

**Scribe**

Eric Wells

**Attendees**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Status</b>
fred carter	AmberPoint	Group Member
Dale Moberg	Axway Software*	Group Member
Jacques Durand	Fujitsu Limited*	Group Member
Robert Freund	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
Eric Wells	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
David Booz	IBM	Group Member
Mike Edwards	IBM	Group Member
Simon Holdsworth	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
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

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">Resolutions.....</a>	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">Actions.....</a>	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">Agenda.....</a>	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">(Item 3) Agenda Bashing.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">(Item 5) Action Items.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">(Item 6) New issues.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">    ISSUE-80: POL30023 should not be a conformance statement .....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">    ISSUE-81: POL40005 needs to be re-marked as Rule2 .....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">    ISSUE-82: asyncInvocation intent .....</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">    ISSUE-83: A single qualifier is not the default .....</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">(Item 7) Testing Discussions.....</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">    POL40005.....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">    TA40026A.....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">    AOB.....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>

### **Resolutions**

**Minutes of Policy TC meeting of May 4th are accepted**

**Issue 80 is Opened**

**Issue 81 is Opened**

**Issue 81 is resolved by inserting the word "Rule2" on line 1097 of the Policy PRD**

**Issue 82 is Opened**

**Issue 83 is opened**

### **Actions**

**Action 20090511-01: Ashok - create a proposal for Issue 83**

**Action 20090511-02: owner=Wells Rewrite TA-POL-40005A/B/C-V2 to make applied intents explicit**

### **Agenda**

1. Roll call
2. Confirm minute taker
3. Agenda bashing
4. Meeting Minutes

Vote to accept minutes from May 4 2009

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200905/msg00001.html>

5. TC Administrivia:

a. Recording issue status - 4 Open

6. PRD status update

a. No issues from PR comment list

b. PR status- Public Review started on April 24, ends June 23.

7. ACTION ITEMS:

a. 2009-04-27-3 status=done owner="EricW" Review POL-40005 and propose how to handle

b. 2009-05-04-1 status=pending owner="DaveB" Consider POL-40010 further for addition TA or modify

8. New Issues

a. ISSUE-80: POL30023 should not be a conformance statement

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-80>

b. ISSUE-81: POL40005 needs to be re-marked as Rule2

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-81>

c. ISSUE-82: asynchInvocation intent

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-82>

d. ISSUE-83: A single qualifier is not the default

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-83>

9. Blocking Issue Discussion

None

10. Testing Discussion

a. Review latest pass at test assertion examples

Latest document: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200905/msg00008.html>

Eric Wells Update: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200905/msg00010.html>

TA20026A/B Discussion: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200905/msg00002.html>

11. Additional Issue Discussion

a. Policy content in the Assembly spec:

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200905/msg00003.html>

b. ISSUE 73: XPath samples are invalid by syntax

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-73>

Proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200903/msg00039.html>

c. ISSUE 76: Conformance statement 30011 is unclear

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-76>

Proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200904/msg00015.html>

12. AOB

a. straggler roll

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

No changes.

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

Minutes from 4<sup>th</sup> May 2009

Minutes are accepted without changes

**Resolution: Minutes of Policy TC meeting of May 4th are accepted**

### ***(Item 5) Action Items***

2009-04-27-1 status=done owner="Editors" Editors (DaveB) to create JIRA for PR comments

2009-04-27-2 status=done owner="DaveB" Raise issue to make statements underlying POL-30023A/B non-normative

2009-04-27-3 status=pending owner="EricW" Review POL-40005 and propose how to handle

2009-04-27-4 status=done owner="Ashok" Combine POL-40010A/B into single TA

2009-04-27-5 status=done owner="DaveB" Raise issue to restore Rule 2 for POL-40015

### ***(Item 6) New issues***

#### **ISSUE-80: POL30023 should not be a conformance statement**

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-80>

Dave Booz outlines the issue.

- more a definitional statement rather than a conformance statement.

- more a redundancy question

Dave Booz moves to open issue 80. Mike E seconds.

No objections - motion passes.

**Resolution: Issue 80 is Opened**

#### **ISSUE-81: POL40005 needs to be re-marked as Rule2**

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-81>

Dave outlines the issue

- "Rule2" got lost in editing work, but still gets referenced from other parts of the spec.

Dave Booz moves to open the issue. Bob Freund seconds.  
No objections- motion passes.

**Resolution: Issue 81 is Opened**

Anish moves to resolve Issue 81 by inserting "Rule2" on line 1097 of the Policy PRD  
Dave B seconds

**Resolution: Issue 81 is resolved by inserting the word  
"Rule2" on line 1097 of the Policy PRD**

### **ISSUE-82: asyncInvocation intent**

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-82>

Ashok describes the issue - that the Assembly spec defines an intent that is not captured in the Policy spec  
Ashok moves to open Issue 82. Mike E seconds  
No objections - motion passes

**Resolution: Issue 82 is Opened**

### **ISSUE-83: A single qualifier is not the default**

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-83>

Eric outlines the issue - that in the case of only a single qualifier, that a default is not needed

Eric moves to open Issue 83. Ashok seconds.  
<Debate about the implications of "default" in the case of there being only a single qualifier>  
The point is that if there are >1 qualifiers, then there MUST be a default - but the wording here does not require a default in the case of 1 qualifier only.  
No objections - motion passes

**Resolution: Issue 83 is opened**

**Action 20090511-01: Ashok - create a proposal for Issue 83**

### ***(Item 7) Testing Discussions***

Review latest pass at test assertion examples  
Latest document: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200905/msg00008.html>  
Eric Wells Update: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200905/msg00010.html>

TA20026A/B Discussion: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200905/msg00002.html>

Start with Eric's update:

## **POL40005**

Several versions of this TA

- originals are there, plus new ones labelled "-V1" and "-V2" at the end

Eric: I favour the "V2" versions

Eric discusses the content of the "V2" versions

Ashok queries whether all 3 versions are required

Eric justifies the need for separate test assertions

Ashok: - Inherited set of intents S1

Ashok: - Intents applied to element S2

Ashok: Intents applied to element are S1 and S2

Dave Booz lowered your hand

Mike E makes a point that the predicate should spell out what is the set that is under test - the prereqs set the scene, but the predicate must be clear about what the actual test is

Eric - I will do a rewrite based on the second versions of these TAs

**Action 20090511-02: owner=Wells Rewrite TA-POL-40005A/B/C-V2 to make applied intents explicit**

## **TA40026A**

Mike E - TA40026A - is it really the SCA runtime that is under test here?

- I think the target is some element deployed in the domain

Eric - I'm not sure that you can't test the runtime.

## **AOB**

None

Next meeting 18<sup>th</sup> May

Close of Business