OASIS

Advancing E-Business Standards Since 1993

## *DRAFT*

## *SCA-Policy TC Teleconference*

## *21 September 2009*

### *Chairs*

Dave Booz, Ashok Malhotra

### *Scribe*

Mike Edwards

### *Attendees*

| Name | Company | Status |
|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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 |

# Table of 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 Administrivia....4
(Item 6) PRD Status....4
(Item 7) Action Items....4
(Item 8) New Issues....4
ISSUE-105: Clarifying the Domain Composite Infoset....4
(item 9) Blocking Issue Discussion....5
(Item 10) Testing discussion....5
(Item 11) Additional Issue Discussion....5
ISSUE 97: Suggestion to address suspected default/unqualified intent ambiguity....5
POLICY-79: Do intents have to be supported if only External Attachment supported?....6
AOB....7


## *Resolutions*

**Minutes of Policy TC meeting of September 14th are accepted**
**Issue 97 is resolved**
**Issue 79 is resolved**

## *Actions*

ACTION 20090921-01: Ashok to open a new issue to deal with the question of evolution and extensibility of intents

## *Agenda*

```
1. Roll call

2. Confirm minute taker

3. Agenda bashing

4. Meeting Minutes
Vote to accept minutes from Sept 14 2009
- http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/34309/SCA%20Policy
%20minutes%202009-09-14.pdf

5. TC Administrivia:
a. Recording issue status - 7 Open
b. LOA for Ashok:
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200909/msg00037.html
```

c. LOA for Martin:
http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200909/msg00036.html

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
c. 20090824-01: status=pending; Ashok to provide wording to resolve issue policy-87

8. New Issues
a. ISSUE-105: Clarifying the Domain Composite Infoset
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-105

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/200909/msg00010.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/200909/msg00011.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/msg00019.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 14th September 2009
Mike E: There is a mistake in the name of the scribe - it should be Eric Wells
Minutes approved with the change in the name of the scribe

**Resolution: Minutes of Policy TC meeting of September 14th are accepted**

## *(Item 5) TC Administrivia*

2 LOAs:

1) Ashok - October 6th to October 12th
Dave: I will be out on October 12th, so that means no chairs available that day.
Agreed: Cancel 12th October meeting
Ashok: What about the October 19th meeting?
Dave: I will be able to prepare the agenda for the 19th
Ashok withdraws his LOA request

2) Martin - Sept 30 - Oct 14
- now covers the 5th Oct meeting only
LOA accepted

## *(Item 6) PRD Status*

Nothing new to report

## *(Item 7) Action Items*

a. -01: status=pending; Mike E: Prepare an updated version of the Specification containing the resolution of Issue 95
b. 20090810-01: status=DONE; Ashok to prepare words for the resolution of Issue 79
c. 20090824-01: status=DONE; Ashok to provide wording to resolve issue policy-87

## *(Item 8) New Issues*

### ISSUE-105: Clarifying the Domain Composite Infoset

http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-105

Ashok: Outlines the issue - started via a discussion initiated by Raymond Feng on the list

relates to @appliesTo attribute of PolicySet
Mike E: Disagrees with the need for the issue - thinks that the email discussion was based on a wrong assumption
<Look into the Policy spec, sections 4.4.1 and 4.4.3>
Ashok: Let's hold off on this issue until next week, to give Raymond some time to look at the emails
Dave: Leave this issue in New state until next week

## *(item 9) Blocking Issue Discussion*

None

## *(Item 10) Testing discussion*

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/200909/msg00010.html

Ashok discusses the proposed wording that is in the email above:
Ashok: "If the unqualified form of a qualifiable intent is attached to an element, it can be satisfied by a policySet that specifies any one of qualified forms of the intent in the value of its @provides attribute.
Or it can be satisfied by a policySet which @provides the unqualified form of the intent.
If the qualified form of the intent is attached to an element then it can be satisfied only by a policy that @provides that qualified form of the intent."

Ashok: Second half of the proposal is about how Intents could/would evolve over time
Ashok: "The normatively defined intents in the SCA specification may evolve over time. New intents may be added, additional qualifiers may be added to existing intents and the default qualifier for existing intents may change. Such changes would cause the namespace for the SCA specification to change."

Rich: I think that the namespace must be updated for an intent if the intent definition is changed/extended
Dave: I'm not exactly sure what namespace you are referring to...
- the namespace of the instance document?
Rich: If anyone changes the definitions of these intents (ie the ones in the spec) then they have broken conformance - so to change/extend them implies a rev of the namespace
Rich is concerned about this statement in section 3.1:
" Users of SCA can define new intents, or extend the qualifier set of existing intents."
- if this is taken to apply to the SCA Policy spec defined intents, then it does imply breaking conformance

Dave: but isn't this simply an extension point that I as a user can use - it does not break compliance to use it, surely

<discussion of what forms of extension are being used in this example>
Dave: If a vendor added an extra qualifier, using the standard qualifier definition elements, then that would be a change to the spec. But they could use extension elements, without causing an incompatibility.
Mike: The current text implies that you can simply go hack the .xml file that holds the standard intent definitions
Dave: But that does not mean that you can't use some non-standard extensions in that .xml file
Ashok: So you (Dave) would remove the statement about the namespace being updated?
Dave: No - actually it is fine in that regard.
- the problem is who is allowed to make the change
- onnly the TC can make changes to the standard definitions, but on the other hand, non-standard extensions must be allowed
Ashok: Perhaps we can resolve the 1st part of the issue and raise a new issue to handle the extensibility question
EricW: +1 to Dave - Only the TC should be able to change spec
Dave: I have no problem with the 1st part
Ashok: moves to resolve Issue 97 with the 1st paragraph of the proposal, listed in the minutes
ie: "Users of SCA can define new intents, or extend the qualifier set of existing intents.
Mike Edwards: If the unqualified form of a qualifiable intent is attached to an element, it can be satisfied by a policySet that specifies any one of qualified forms of the intent in the value of its @provides attribute.
Or it can be satisfied by a policySet which @provides the unqualified form of the intent.
If the qualified form of the intent is attached to an element then it can be satisfied only by a policy that @provides that qualified form of the intent."
Rich seconds
Motion carried unanimously

**Resolution: Issue 97 is resolved**

**ACTION 20090921-01: Ashok to open a new issue to deal with the question of evolution and extensibility of intents**

### 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/200909/msg00011.html
-> Issue 79 Wording.doc
Ashok: Basic idea is that the runtime must recognise all the intents defined in the spec
- but what you do with these intents is not specified

Ashok moves to resolve Issue 79 using the proposal contained in http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200909/msg00011.html
Mike seconds
Motion passes unanimously

**Resolution: Issue 79 is resolved**

## AOB

None

Next meeting 28 September
Close of Business