

DRAFT**SCA-Policy TC Teleconference****16 November 2009****Chairs**

Dave Booz, Ashok Malhotra

Scribe

Mike Edwards

Attendees

Name	Company	Status
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
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
Pundalik Kudapkar	TIBCO Software Inc.	Group Member
Dale Moberg	Axway Software*	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
(Item 9) Blocking Issues.....	4
(Item 11) Existing Issues.....	4
 ISSUE 94: Allow intents to be attached using an element	4
 ISSUE 109: Intents are still not optional - even after resolution of Issue 79	5
 ISSUE 93: Allow external attachment for intents	6
 ISSUE 92: Block Intent Inheritance	6
(Item 11) Testing discussion.....	7
AOB.....	7

Resolutions

Minutes of Policy TC meeting of November 9th are accepted

Issue 94 is resolved

Issue 109 is resolved

Actions

ACTION 20091116-01: Ashok to raise a new issue relating to the Intent Override wording

Agenda

1. Roll call
2. Confirm minute taker
3. Agenda bashing
4. Meeting Minutes
Vote to accept minutes from Nov 9 2009
- <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/35069/SCA%20Policy%20minutes%202009-11-09.pdf>
5. TC Administrivia:
 - a. Recording issue status - 4 Open
6. PRD status update

a. 9 issues from PR 01 comment list that still need responses (Dave)

7. ACTION ITEMS:

a. 20091019-03: owner=AshokM status=pending Write detailed proposal for POLICY-92

b. 20091109-01: owner=AshokM status=done Raise an issue in Assembly to permit a subelement of a element

c. 20091109-02: owner=AshokM status=done Add element extensibility for and elements in the schema

8. New Issues

none

9. Blocking Issue Discussion

None

10. Additional Issue Discussion

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

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

proposal attached: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200911/msg00031.html>

b. ISSUE 109: Intents are still not optional - even after resolution of Issue 79

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-109>

proposal in JIRA

c. ISSUE 93: Allow external attachment for intents

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

proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200911/msg00002.html>

latest: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200911/msg00006.html>

d. ISSUE 92: Block Intent Inheritance

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

11. Testing

a. Test Status:

<http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200911/msg00047.html>

- Test Assertion Document:

DOC: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/35139/SCA-Policy-1.1-Test-Assertions-WD-05.doc>

PDF: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/35138/SCA-Policy-1.1-Test-Assertions-WD-05.pdf>

- Test Case Documents

ODT: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/35141/sca-policy-1.1-testcases-wd02.odt>

PDF: <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/35140/sca-policy-1.1-testcases-wd02.pdf>

- Testcase code:

<http://tools.oasis-open.org/version-control/svn/sca-policy/TestCases/>

12. AOB

a. straggler roll

(Item 3) Agenda Bashing

No changes

(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC

Minutes from 9th November 2009

Minutes approved without change

**Resolution: Minutes of Policy TC meeting of November 9th
are accepted**

(Item 5) TC Administrivia

4 open issues

(Item 6) PRD Status

9 issues from PR 01 comment list that still need responses (Dave)

(Item 7) Action Items

- a. 20091019-03: owner=AshokM status=pending Write detailed proposal for POLICY-92
- b. 20091109-01: owner=AshokM status=done Raise an issue in Assembly to permit a subelement of a element
- c. 20091109-02: owner=AshokM status=done Add element extensibility for and elements in the schema

(Item 8) New Issues

None

(Item 9) Blocking Issues

None

(Item 11) Existing Issues

ISSUE 94: Allow intents to be attached using an element

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

proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200911/msg00031.html>

sca-policy-1.1-spec-cd02-rev4-Issue94_mje_dab-am.doc

Ashok presents the latest proposal.

Most of the changes are in the schemas

<discussion of details of the schema changes>

Ashok moves to resolve Issue 94 with the proposal linked in the agenda

Mike seconds
Motion passes unanimously

Resolution: Issue 94 is resolved

ISSUE 109: Intents are still not optional - even after resolution of Issue 79

<http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-109>
Proposal in JIRA

Dave discusses the proposal.

Dave built sca-policy-1.1-spec-cd02-rev5.doc containing the resolution for Issue 79.
This is a new rev of the Policy spec that contains the resolution of Issue 79, which is the subject of this issue and its proposal.

Section 11 - Conformance section - Bullet #2

Currently it says:

"2.SCA implementations MUST recognize the intents listed in Appendix B.1 of this specification. The manner in which specific intents are processed must be in accord with any relevant Conformance Items in Appendix C related to the intent and the SCA Runtime options selected."

Dave Booz: second sentence change to:

"An implementationType / bindingType / collection of policySets that claims to implement a specific intent must process that intent in accord with any relevant Conformance items in Appendix C related to the intent and the SCA Runtime options selected."

Dave: The subtlety here is that we don't require the support of the specific intents, but that IF they are supported, they must be supported in the way defined in the spec.

Ashok: What about the item that Dale raised? He was concerned about guarantees.

Dale: I am concerned to ensure that certain requirements in the Security arena are guaranteed for specific environments.

Dale: I am not sure that the new language here really does that

Ashok: I think that it is the PolicySets which force the specifics and give the guarantees

Dale: Intents do allow the flexibility, but they do require that certain pieces of function are provided.

Eric: Is the "must" in the new sentence normative ?

Dave: This is like the "must" words in bullet 1) and bullet 3)

Eric - but it isn't upper case

Dave: Ah, I agree with you Eric - it should be upper case

Dave: I think Dale's issue is a different issue from this one

Ashok: Yes, I think that Dale's issue is really with the statements relating to the override of intents

Dale:: Yes I agree

Ashok: Let's raise a new issue on the override wording

ACTION 20091116-01: Ashok to raise a new issue relating to the Intent Override wording

Dave moves to resolve issue 109 with the proposal in the JIRA with the "must" changed to uppercase

Dale seconds

Motion carried unanimously

Resolution: Issue 109 is resolved

ISSUE 93: Allow external attachment for intents

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

proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200911/msg00002.html>

latest: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200911/msg00006.html>

Ashok: this provides the capability to add intents via external attachment

Ashok: wants to enable policy manipulation completely independently of the SC DL artifacts

Mike: I really don't see the point of this. Instead of attaching some intent, you can use the same external attachment to attach one or more actual policySets to the same locations.

Ashok: Let me try and spell out a lifecycle story and see if there is agreement about that

ISSUE 92: Block Intent Inheritance

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

Ashok: Here is a "one line summary" of this

At the moment, there is the need to move stuff around between different elements, this makes things complex - why not restrict to the places where they apply?

Mike: The function such as allowing an intent to attach to a composite element is that it allows a shorthand way to attach the intent to all the elements
eg - to all services within a composite

Ashok: But we found that in practice it did not work out that way - eg there would be exceptions within a composite and that makes it unusable

Dave: Did you mean the implementation hierarchy AND the structural hierarchy

Ashok: This really means the structural hierarchy

Dave: So for an interaction intent, this would mean on the bindings

Ashok: Yes

<ran out of time for discussion>

(Item 11) Testing discussion

None

AOB

Next meeting 30 November

Close of Business