

**FINAL****SCA-Policy TC Teleconference****14 September 2009****Chairs**

Dave Booz, Ashok Malhotra

**Scribe**

Eric Wells

**Attendees**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Status</b>
Dale Moberg	Axway Software*	Group Member
Robert Freund	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
Eric Wells	Hitachi, Ltd.	Group Member
David Booz	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
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="#">3</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="#">4</a>
<a href="#">(Item 7) Action Items.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">(Item 8) New Issues.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">(item 9) Blocking Issue Discussion.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">(Item 10) Testing discussion.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">(Item 11) Additional Issue Discussion.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">ISSUE 97: Suggestion to address suspected default/unqualified intent ambiguity ....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">POLICY-79: Do intents have to be supported if only External Attachment</a>	
<a href="#">supported? .....</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">Issue 87: Clarification re. value of appliesTo.....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">AOB.....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>

## Resolutions

**Minutes of Policy TC meeting of August 24th are accepted**

## Actions

Action 20090914-01: owner=RichL & AshokM Agree on additional wording to cover default case for POLICY-97 due=20090924

## Agenda

1. Roll call
2. Confirm minute taker
3. Agenda bashing
4. Meeting Minutes  
Vote to accept minutes from Aug 24 2009  
<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/34182/SCA%20Policy%20minutes%202009-08-24.pdf>
5. TC Administrivia:
  - a. Recording issue status - 7 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. 20090810-01: status=pending; Ashok to prepare words for the resolution of Issue 79

8. New Issues  
none

9. Blocking Issue Discussion  
None

10. Testing  
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>  
b. We need volunteers to begin writing test cases

11. Additional Issue Discussion  
a. 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  
b. 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/msg00049.html>  
c. ISSUE 87: Clarification re. values of @appliesTo.  
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-87>  
Latest Discussion: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200909/msg00004.html>  
d. ISSUE 94: Allow intents to be attached using an element  
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-94>  
e. ISSUE 93: Allow external attachment for intents  
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-93>  
f. ISSUE 92: Block Intent Inheritance  
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-92>  
g. ISSUE 104: Clarify meaning of 'does not have to support intents' in Conformance section  
<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-104>

12. AOB  
a. straggler roll

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

No changes

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

Minutes from 24th August 2009

Minutes are accepted without change

**Resolution: Minutes of Policy TC meeting of August 24th  
are accepted**

#### ***(Item 5) TC Administrvia***

None

#### ***(Item 7) Action Items***

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

b. 20090810-01: status=pending; Ashok to prepare words for the resolution of Issue 79  
See discussion of Issue 79

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

None

#### ***(item 9) Blocking Issue Discussion***

None

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

a. Test assertion document status

Latest Documents:

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/33759/SCA-Policy-1.1-Test-Assertions-WD-03.pdf>

<http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/33758/SCA-Policy-1.1-Test-Assertions-WD-03.doc>

b. We need volunteers to begin writing test cases

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

#### **ISSUE 97: Suggestion to address suspected default/unqualified intent ambiguity**

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

Latest discussion:

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

Ashok has posted word to clarify qualified/unqualified:

"If the SCDL contains the unqualified form of a qualifiable intent, it can be satisfied with a policy that specifies any one of qualified forms of the intent. Or it can be satisfied by a

policy which specifies the unqualified form of the intent. If the SCDL contains the qualified form of the intent then it can be satisfied only by a policy that specifies that qualified form of the intent"

RichL: Concern regarding extending the extent of existing intents  
... can change the default???

AshokM: Is this another issue? Can resolve POLICY-97 with proposal then address default in a new issue?

RichL: Seems more like some loose ends that need tidying up to completely address original issue

EricW: @nonoverridable??? ;-)

Dave Booz: dont go there Eric

Ashok: Dave: Do not change default but can add qualifiers

EricW: EricW: Hence the ;-)

RichL: Do we want to say no matter what the intents THIS is the default?

**Action 20090914-01: owner=RichL & AshokM Agree on additional wording to cover default case for POLICY-97 due=20090924**

AshokM: I'm concerned that this issue is taking too long - need to make sure new proposal is ready for discussion next week

### **POLICY-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/msg00049.html>

AshokM: Need to say that all intents must be RECOGNIZED regardless of direct/external attachment

AshokM: RECOGNIZED means not failing on an unknown intent if intents are not supported

Discussion/clarification on what this means - particularly for external attachments using XPath

Refer to spec: bullet 2 in section 11 - Conformance  
- Change MAY to "MUST NOT FAIL"

Second part of issue

Ashok: All intents in the required intent set for an element MUST be provided by the directly provided intents set and the set of policySets that apply to the element. However, an SCA Runtime can allow a deployer to force deployment even in the presence of such errors. The behaviors and options enforced by a deployer are not specified.

AshokM: So have all intents been satisfied or not?

AshokM: Could remove the ability to force deployment and just have "MUST be provided"

DaveB: That seems too strong but SHOULD or MAY doesn't seem right

... change MUST to SHOULD and add text to say runtime MUST raise warning if intents not satisfied

Reference AI 20090810-01: status=pending; Ashok to prepare words for the resolution of Issue 79

### **Issue 87: Clarification re. value of appliesTo**

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

AshokM: Response to Dave's email: Is it better to switch context to document than use XPath

DaveB: But need to consider implementation hierarchy

AshokM: Hadn't considered this - will need to think on this further

### **AOB**

None

Next meeting 21 September

Close of Business