

DRAFT**SCA-Policy TC Teleconference****18 January 2010****Chairs**

Dave Booz, Ashok Malhotra

Scribe

Mike Edwards

Attendees

Name	Company	Status
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
Jeff Mischkinsky	Oracle Corporation	Group Member
Gilbert Pilz	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

Resolutions.....	2
Actions.....	2
Agenda.....	2
(Item 3) Agenda Bashing.....	3
(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC.....	3
(Item 5) TC Administrivia.....	3
(Item 6) PRD Status.....	3
(Item 7) Action Items.....	4
(Item 8) New Issues.....	4
(Item 10) Open Issues.....	4
ISSUE 93: Allow external attachment for intents	4
AOB.....	6

Resolutions

Minutes of Policy TC meeting of January 11th are accepted

Actions

Agenda

1. Roll call
2. Confirm minute taker
3. Agenda bashing
4. Meeting Minutes
Vote to accept minutes from Jan 11 2009
- <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/35892/SCA%20Policy%20minutes%202010-01-11.pdf>
5. TC Administrivia:
 - a. Recording issue status - 1 Open
6. PRD status update
 - a. 9 issues from PR 01 comment list that still need responses (Dave)
7. ACTION ITEMS:
 - a. 20091214-01: owner=editors status=pending correct typo in the caption title for snippet 4-21 "woth" instead of "with"
 - b. 20091214-02: owner=Dave status=pending Upgrade candidate CD03 to the new Assembly namespace
 - c. 20100104-01: owner=editors status=pending Fix the name of the file in Appendix B1 to match the actual name of the file.
 - d. 20100104-02: owner=Ashok status=done to prepare a revised proposal for Issue 79

8. New Issues

None

9. Blocking Issue Discussion

None

10. Additional Issue Discussion

a. ISSUE 93: Allow external attachment for intents

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

proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/201001/msg00007.html>

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 11th January 2010

Minutes approved without change

**Resolution: Minutes of Policy TC meeting of January 11th
are accepted**

(Item 5) TC Administrivia

1 open issue

(Item 6) PRD Status

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

(Item 7) Action Items

- a. 20091214-01: owner=editors status=pending correct typo in the caption title for snippet 4-21 "woth" instead of "with"
- b. 20091214-02: owner=Dave status=pending Upgrade candidate CD03 to the new Assembly namespace
- c. 20100104-01: owner=editors status=pending Fix the name of the file in Appendix B1 to match the actual name of the file.
- d. 20100104-02: owner=Ashok status=done to prepare a revised proposal for Issue 79

All remaining actions are editorials for the next CD

(Item 8) New Issues

None

(Item 10) Open Issues

ISSUE 93: Allow external attachment for intents

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

proposal: <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/201001/msg00007.html>

Ashok outlines the proposal as contained in SCA Policy Framework CD02-Rev6-Issue93.pdf

Ashok also describes the use of SCA built into the Cloud, to which this can apply
- requires more and different kinds of flexibility

Proposal involves adding an attribute to <intent> specification = @attachTo

- works like the @attachTo attribute for PolicySets

> moved the Infoset material in an appendix since it no longer only applies to PolicySets

Note - if doing external attachment of intents, need to attach them BEFORE attaching PolicySets

Changes in the document:

Section 3.1 - added the @attachTo attribute on an intent

Section 4.1 - contains the attachment rules

attachment rules are parallel to the rules for policySets

Section 4.3 - new section describing external attachment

Section 4.6 - updates plus removed of the description of the infoset (to new appendix)

+ new appendix containing the Infoset definition

Dave: Can you deal with the use cases again please?

Typically policies are corporate policies

(Ashok) Typically policies are corporate policies

- can't trust our programmers to attach intents in all cases, so externally attach from the outside eg "secure by default"

Dave: When does this process happen?

Ashok: After code is written, before deployment

Dave: We'd call that "during Assembly"

So, you'd include the SCA composites as part of the "executable code"?

Ashok: Yes

Mike: Why do you want to attach Intents as well as PolicySets?

Ashok: Yes, they are thinking that new intents will be defined over time - they will change - so we need a mechanism for that

Dave: So are the Policy guys involved in Assembly?

Ashok: Yes

Dave: This dynamic change idea seems to me more to be what PolicySets do in the current model

Ashok: We are using Intents more widely than we originally thought
- we have a more dynamic view of what they are

Mike: What does the externally attached intent get used for once it is attached?

Ashok: It is used for selecting policies.

Dave: So what is the distinction between a policy set and an intent in that case?

Ashok: Intents are abstract requirements, but they can change over time, as can policySets

Dave: What aspect of the application is it that is dealt with by an intent that changes over time that would not be dealt with by a policySet that changes over time?

Mike: Why do you need to use intents to attach some new capability, when the policySets external attachment already does this?

Ashok: Because we have a model where intents are expressing abstract requirements that are satisfied / select some specific policySets

Jeff: Why do we have both intents and policySets in the model, then?

Ashok: Because intents express abstract requirements, whereas policySets have concrete policies

Jeff, so why do you have both

Dave: The way intents are in the spec today, is that they capture requirements of the application, which must be satisfied - this is not a point of variability that can change over time

- it seems as if we're making intents just like policy - blurring the difference

Jeff: What harm does this proposal do?

Dave: I don't imagine that we would use this capability, although that is not a reason to keep it out of spec

Mike E motivates the original reason for the use of intents

Ashok - I am arguing that there are requirements that can come from a policy guy not from the programmer/assembler and the policy guy wants to attach them separately

Ashok: Surely it is better to keep separate the abstract policy requirement from the concrete policy

Dave: It is matter of how many concepts the guy has to deal with

- his main task is to get policy attached at the right places

Ashok: Why don't we carry on this discussion next week
Please also send email to the list expressing points of view

AOB

Next meeting 25 January
Close of Business