

## Suggested Responses to Issues Raised As a Result of the Public Review

### **Policy 82 asynchInvocation intent**

This note is about the resolution of the issue you raised as a result of the first public review of the SCA Policy Framework specification in <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200905/msg00009.html>

Description:

Section 7.3.3 of the Assembly spec defines an `asynchInvocation` intent.

This does not appear in section 10 Miscellaneous Intents in the Policy Spec

This issue was resolved on the August 10, 2009 telcon (see <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200908/msg00016.html>) by adding the `asynchInvocation` intent to section 10 of the SCA Policy Framework Specification

We trust you will find this resolution satisfactory. If not, please let us know by responding to this note.

### **Policy 86 Policy Set Schema and Psuedoschema**

This note is to convey to you the resolution of the issue raised by you as a result of the first public review of the SCA Policy Framework specification in <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy-comment/200906/msg00000.html>

**Description:** The psuedoschema for `policySet` in section 3.4 says that the `appliesTo` attribute is optional. But the schema in Appendix A1 says that it is required.

This was resolved on the June 29, 2009 telcon (see <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200906/msg00050.html>) by making the `@appliesTo` attribute optional in the schema

We trust you will find this resolution satisfactory. If not, please let us know by responding to this note.

### **Policy 87 Clarification re. value of appliesTo**

This note is to convey to you the resolution of the issue raised by you as a result of the first public review of the SCA Policy Framework specification in <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy-comment/200906/msg00001.html>

**Description:** In section 3.4 we explain that the value of the appliesTo attribute is an XPath 1.0 expression. But the first example illustrating a policySays contains the line appliesTo="sca:binding.ws". This does not look like a XPath expression. Needs clarification.

This was resolved on the October 5, 2009 telcon (see <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200910/msg00035.html>) . The XPath was changed to //sca:binding but the issue was broadened and the proposal in the first four bullets of the file attached to <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200909/msg00063.html> was accepted

We trust you will find this resolution satisfactory. If not, please let us know by responding to this note.

## **Policy 88 Attaching Intents to WSDL definitions**

This note is to convey to you the resolution of the issue raised by you as a result of the first public review of the SCA Policy Framework specification in <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy-comment/200906/msg00002.html> which asks that wording in the Policy spec be clarified as to the handling of intents attached to WSDL definitions, perhaps along the lines of corresponding wording in the Assembly spec.

This issue was resolved on the August 10, 2009 telcon (see <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200908/msg00016.html>) by accepting the proposal in <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200908/msg00008.html>

We trust you will find this resolution satisfactory. If not, please let us know by responding to this note.

## **Policy 89 Location of Intents and policySets**

This note is to convey to you the resolution of the issue raised by you as a result of the first public review of the SCA Policy Framework specification in <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy-comment/200906/msg00003.html>. This note raises a concern that intents and policySets must be defined in files and asks whether it is possible to contribute intents and policySets using URIs and namespace declarations.

During discussion of this issue it was pointed out that the specs allowed a great deal of flexibility and artifacts can be contributed to an SCA domain in a variety of ways including URIs and namespaces and, thus, no change was needed to the

specifications. See minutes from August 24, 2009 <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200908/msg00053.html>

We trust you will find this resolution satisfactory. If not, please let us know by responding to this note.

## **Policy 90 Fine-grained authorization**

This note is to convey to you the resolution of the issue raised by you as a result of the first public review of the SCA Policy Framework specification in <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy-comment/200906/msg00004.html>.

Description: Section 7.3 of the spec describes the 'authorization' intent. This qualifiable intent has but a single qualifier: fineGrain and this qualifier is the default.

What this means is that if an implementer specifies the 'authorization' intent he will get 'authorization.fineGrain'. This does not seem right as 'fineGrain' describes a specific type of authorization and one that some feel is overly complex.

This issue was resolved on the August 24, 2009 telcon (see <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200908/msg00053.html>) by removing the fine-grain qualifier from the authorization intent.

We trust you will find this resolution satisfactory. If not, please let us know by responding to this note.

## **Policy 92 Block Intent Inheritance**

This note is to convey to you the resolution of the issue raised by you as a result of the first public review of the SCA Policy Framework specification in <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy-comment/200906/msg00006.html>.

This issue was deferred to SCA Policy 1.2 discussion to be discussed in the context of capabilities support on the December 7, 2009 telcon (see <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200912/msg00010.html>)

We trust you will find this resolution satisfactory. If not, please let us know by responding to this note.

## **Policy 93 External Attachment of Intent**

This note is to convey to you the resolution of the issue raised by you as a result of the first public review of the SCA Policy Framework specification in <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy-comment/200906/msg00007.html> which requests that a mechanism be added to allow external attachment of intents.

This issue was resolved on the March 15, 2010 telcon (see <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/201003/msg00025.html>) by accepting the proposal attached to <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/201003/msg00019.html>

We trust you will find this resolution satisfactory. If not, please let us know by responding to this note.

## **Policy 94 Attachment of Intents Using an Element**

This note is to convey to you the resolution of the issue raised by you as a result of the first public review of the SCA Policy Framework specification in <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy-comment/200906/msg00008.html> which requests that a mechanism be added to allow intents to be attached using an element.

This was resolved on the Nov 16, 2009 telcon (see <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200911/msg00053.html>) by accepting the proposal attached to <http://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/sca-policy/200911/msg00031.html>.

We trust you will find this resolution satisfactory. If not, please let us know by responding to this note.