

**FINAL****SCA-Policy TC Teleconference****17 August 2009****Chairs**

Dave Booz, Ashok Malhotra

**Scribe**

Mike Edwards

**Attendees**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Status</b>
Dale Moberg	Axway Software*	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
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
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) TC Administrivia.....</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">(Item 6) Action Items.....</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">(Item 8) New Issues.....</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">ISSUE 103:Syntax errors in http://tools.oasis-open.org/version-control/browse/wsvn/sca-assembly/SCA_XSDS/sca-policy-1.1-intents-definitions-cd02.xml .....</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">ISSUE 104:Clarify meaning of 'does not have to support intents' in Conformance section .....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">(Item 10) Testing discussion.....</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">(Item 11) Additional Issue Discussion.....</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">ISSUE 101: EJB Binding spec (SCA-J TC) has defined a new intent - EJB .....</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">ISSUE 100: POL30020 is incorrect .....</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">ISSUE 79: Do intents have to be supported if only External Attachment supported? .....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">AOB.....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>

### **Resolutions**

**Minutes of Policy TC meeting of August 10th are accepted with the one change to say "Issue 83 is resolved" for the final resolution**

**Issue 103 is opened**

**Issue 103 is resolved**

**Issue 104 is opened**

**Issue 101 is resolved**

**Issue 100 is resolved**

### **Actions**

None

### **Agenda**

1. Roll call

2. Confirm minute taker

3. Agenda bashing

#### 4. Meeting Minutes

Vote to accept minutes from Aug 10 2009

- need to be fixed, issue 88 is resolved twice, one of them should be issue 83.
- <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/33725/SCA%20Policy%20minutes%202009-08-10.pdf>

#### 5. TC Administrivia:

- a. Recording issue status - 10 Open

#### 6. PRD status update

- a. 9 issues from PR 01 comment list that need responses

#### 7. ACTION ITEMS:

- a. 20090706-01: status=pending; Mike E: Prepare an updated version of the Specification containing the resolution of Issue 95
- b. 20090720-03: status=done: Mike to add a new TA for the implementation policy case of POL40004
- c. 20090720-04: status=done: Dave - strike last row of POL-TA-40021
- d. 20090727-01: status=done: Dave to raise an issue against the Policy spec to deal with the inconsistency relating to the support of intents
- e. 20090727-02: status=done: Dave to remove the 2nd prereq from POL-TA-80001 & POLTA-80002 & POL-TA-80003
- f. 20090810-01 Ashok to prepare words for the resolution of Issue 79

#### 8. New Issues

- a. ISSUE 103: Syntax errors in [http://tools.oasis-open.org/version-control/browse/wsvn/sca-assembly/SCA\\_XSDS/sca-policy-1.1-intents-definitions-cd02.xml](http://tools.oasis-open.org/version-control/browse/wsvn/sca-assembly/SCA_XSDS/sca-policy-1.1-intents-definitions-cd02.xml)  
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-103>
- b. ISSUE 104: Clarify meaning of 'does not have to support intents' in Conformance section  
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-104>  
discussion: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200908/msg00032.html>

#### 9. Blocking Issue Discussion

None

#### 10. Testing Discussion

- a. Test assertion document status

Latest Documents (pdf): <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/33759/SCA-Policy-1.1-Test-Assertions-WD-03.pdf>  
(doc): <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/33758/SCA-Policy-1.1-Test-Assertions-WD-03.doc>

## 11. Additional Issue Discussion

a. ISSUE 101: EJB Binding spec (SCA-J TC) has defined a new intent - EJB

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-101>

b. ISSUE 100: POL30020 is incorrect

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-100>

c. ISSUE 97: Suggestion to address suspected default/unqualified intent ambiguity

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-97>

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200907/msg00051.html>

Pending wording from Rich and Ashok

d. ISSUE 79: Do intents have to be supported if only External Attachment supported?

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-79>

Latest discussion: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200908/msg00036.html>

e. ISSUE 87: Clarification re. values of @appliesTo.

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-87>

f. ISSUE 94: Allow intents to be attached using an element

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-94>

g. ISSUE 93: Allow external attachment for intents

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-93>

h. ISSUE 92: Block Intent Inheritance

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-92>

i. ISSUE 90: Fine-grained authorization

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-90>

j. ISSUE 89: Location of intents and policySets

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-89>

## 12. AOB

a. straggler roll

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

Dave would like to discuss upcoming telecons in the Administrivia section

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

Minutes from 10th<sup>d</sup> August 2009

Dave: the minutes have a typo.

Say that Issue 88 is resolved twice - think that the other one should be Issue 83

Second one should say "Issue 83 is resolved"

Ashok moves to accept the minutes of 10th August, with the one change to say "Issue 83 is resolved" for the final resolution

Eric seconds

Motion accepted unanimously

**Resolution: Minutes of Policy TC meeting of August 10th are accepted with the one change to say "Issue 83 is resolved" for the final resolution**

### ***(Item 5) TC Administtrivia***

10 open issues

- some of these require proposals

b) Upcoming calls

Aug 31 is Bank Holiday in UK

Sep 7 is a public holiday in USA

Cancel both of these calls.

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

a. 20090706-01: status=pending; Mike E: Prepare an updated version of the Specification containing the resolution of Issue 95

f. 20090810-01 Ashok to prepare words for the resolution of Issue 79

all others are done...

### ***(Item 8) New Issues***

**ISSUE 103: Syntax errors in [http://tools.oasis-open.org/version-control/browse/wsvn/sca-assembly/SCA\\_XSDS/sca-policy-1.1-intents-definitions-cd02.xml](http://tools.oasis-open.org/version-control/browse/wsvn/sca-assembly/SCA_XSDS/sca-policy-1.1-intents-definitions-cd02.xml)**

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-103>

Dave presents the issue

a) "ordered" intent has a pure type

b) 1\_1 and 1\_2 qualifiers for SOAP intent - invalid NCNames

anish: NCName ::= (Letter | '\_' ) (NCNameChar)\*

Dave moves to open Issue 103

Mike seconds

Anish: <http://www.w3.org/TR/1999/REC-xml-names-19990114/#NT-NCNameChar>

Anish discusses what is legal for an NCName

Agrees that NCName cannot start with a digit

Motion carried unanimously

**Resolution: Issue 103 is opened**

<Consideration of possible proposals to resolve this issue>

Dave Booz: motion: "resolve issue 103 by replacing the @appliesTo on the ordered intent with @constrains and rename the SOAP intent qualifiers to 'V1\_1' and 'V1\_2' respectively."

Rich Levinson raises a point about the recent OASIS Board ruling making the XSDs (and other auxiliary files) normative over the spec

Ashok: I think that is a different topic, and we have a motion to resolve Issue 103

anish: V or v?

Rich seconds the motion

Simon Holdsworth According to assembly it should be v I believe

Simon Holdsworth From assembly:

"For the names of intents, the names follow the CamelCase convention, with all names starting 72 with a lower case letter, EXCEPT for cases where the intent represents an established acronym, 73 in which case the entire name is in upper case. 74 An example of an intent which is an acronym is the "SOAP" intent."

Mike moves to amend the motion, to use lower case "v" rather than upper case

Anish seconds

Amended carried unanimously

Main motion reads:

"Resolve issue 103 by replacing the @appliesTo on the ordered intent with @constrains and rename the SOAP intent qualifiers to 'v1\_1' and v1\_2' respectively."

Motion carried unanimously

### **Resolution: Issue 103 is resolved**

Rich: I support the initiative that the OASIS Board has put forward relating to the normative status of XSD files, but I think that OASIS TCs should adopt procedures to ensure that spec documents and external files don't drift apart.

Ashok: The concern that I have is that the specs often express extra constraints that cannot be captured in the XSDs

### **ISSUE 104:Clarify meaning of 'does not have to support intents' in Conformance section**

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-104>

Discussion: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200908/msg00032.html>

Ashok: I think that this is covered by Issue 79, so I'm not in favour of opening this issue

Dave: I think that Issue 79 is addressing a slightly different question.

Issue 104 is all about the meaning of the word "support"

Ashok: Can we open this one and indicate that it is related to Issue 79

Dave: Yes, we can link them in JIRA

Dave moves to Open issue 104

Mike seconds

Motion carried unanimously

### **Resolution: Issue 104 is opened**

### ***(Item 10) Testing discussion***

a. Test assertion document status

Latest Documents (pdf): <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/33759/SCA-Policy-1.1-Test-Assertions-WD-03.pdf>  
(doc): <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/33758/SCA-Policy-1.1-Test-Assertions-WD-03.doc>

Dave: WD03 has been published

- think that this is complete and we are in a position to start writing testcases

Ashok: only one thing remains - a cross-ref table at the end

### ***(Item 11) Additional Issue Discussion***

#### **ISSUE 101: EJB Binding spec (SCA-J TC) has defined a new intent - EJB**

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-101>

Dave describes the issue - derives from the EJB Binding spec in the SCA-J TC

There is a proposal in the JIRA for words to add to the Miscellaneous Intents chapter of the Policy spec

Ashok: We shall have to add this to the intents.xml document

Dave moves to resolve Issue 101 with the proposal in the JIRA, plus the update of the intents xml document in the Appendix

Mike seconds

Motion passes without objection

**Resolution:**      **Issue 101 is resolved**

#### **ISSUE 100: POL30020 is incorrect**

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-100>

Dave - this came from the TA review. There is a proposal to change POL30020 is read:

"If a policySet specifies a qualifiable intent in the @provides attribute, and it provides an intentMap for the qualifiable intent then that intentMap MUST specify all possible qualifiers for that intent."

Dave moves to resolve Issue 100 with the proposal in the JIRA

Mike seconds

Motion passes unanimously

**Resolution:**      **Issue 100 is resolved**

## **ISSUE 79: Do intents have to be supported if only External Attachment supported?**

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-79>

Latest discussion: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200908/msg00036.html>

Ashok - let us discuss this briefly

Ashok describes a scenario in which SCDL containing intents does not have all those intents satisfied by the combination of policies and bindings

Mike - I believe that it should be possible to have SCDL with any of the intents in the intents XML file defined in the Policy spec - and that is always valid. Some intents may not be satisfied by the combination of bindings + policy sets - in this case it is up to the runtime as to whether the application can run or not.

Ashok - I take the view that the behaviour should be different between External Attachment and Direct Attachment of policy sets

### **AOB**

None

Next meeting 24th August

Close of Business