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Resolutions

Resolution: Issue 64 is opened
Resolution: Issue 65 is opened
Resolution: Issue 66 is opened

Actions
None

Agenda

1. Roll call

2. Confirm minute taker, Mike Edwards

3. Agenda bashing

4. Meeting Minutes
   Vote to accept minutes from Jan 12, 2009 meeting

5. TC Logistics:
   a. Recording issue status - 5 Open
   b. F2F proposal - Jan 28,29 at Oracle in Redwood Shores

6. ACTION ITEMS
20081124-01: Rich L & Ashok - Build the detailed proposal for the resolution of Issue 57
20090105-01: Dave B to write up spec text for Issue 33 based on latest proposal
20090112-01: (Mike E) Raise an Issue regarding lack of formal XML definition of Intents defined in the Policy spec.
20090112-02: (Dave B) To formally respond to liaison committee with the text held in the email referenced above.
DONE
20090112-02: (Ashok) Raise an issue regarding the places where interaction intents can be attached

7. New Issues
None

8. Issue Discussion
a. ISSUE-62: RFC2119 text updates
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-62
Proposal:
b. ISSUE-33: Capabilities
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-33
Proposal:
c. ISSUE 57: Fine grain authorization intent
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-57
Proposal:

9. AOB
a. straggler roll

(Item 3) Agenda Bashing
No changes

(Item 4) Minutes from previous meeting of Policy TC
Jan 12th minutes.
Action items for last meeting all had year 2008 in them - need to update these
Need to add Fabian Ritzmann to the roll
- leave approval of the minutes to next week

(Item 5) TC Logistics
There are 3 Open Issues
(Item 6) Action Items

20081124-01: Rich L & Ashok - Build the detailed proposal for the resolution of Issue 57
  Target for F2F
20090105-01: Dave B to write up spec text for Issue 33 based on latest proposal
  Outstanding
20090112-01: (Mike E) Raise an Issue regarding lack of formal XML definition of
  Intents defined in the Policy spec.
  Outstanding
  d. 20090112-02: (Dave B) To formally respond to liaison committee with the text held in
     the email referenced above.
     DONE
e. 20090112-02: (Ashok) Raise an issue regarding the places where
     interaction intents can be attached
     Outstanding

Discussion relating to email relating to action item 20090112-02:
Discussion of the distinction between the term "attach" and the term "appliesTo"
attach = where something is logically attached in the SCDL structure
apply = the element(s) in the SCDL structure to which the policy intents are meant to
apply to, irrespective of where they are attached (ie "flow down" the hierarchy)
So; implementation intents CAN apply to bindings if the idea is to affect the way in
which those bindings operate
Dave Booz: email with reference to usage of impl intents applying to a binding:
Ashok - should not allow implementation intents to be attached to <service/> <binding/>
<reference/>
Ashok - Should we open an issue for this?
Dave: Yes
Sanjay: Did we ever have an implementation intent for logging / auditing?
Ashok: No - only ever used as examples - no formal intents for that...

(Item 7) New Issues

Issue 64 Policy Specification is missing formal definitions of the various Intents
http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-64
Description:
The SCA Policy specification describes a series of Intents. However, there are no formal
XML definitions of these Intents. There should be full XML definitions of every Intent
defined in the SCA Policy specification.

Mike E moves to open Issue 64
Ashok seconds
Mike E: eg
<definitions xmlns="http://www.osoa.org/xmlns/sca/1.0" >
<intent name="atLeastOnce" appliesTo="sca:binding">
<description>
This intent is used to indicate that a message sent by a client is always delivered to the component.
</description>
</intent>

...they would look something like that

Motion is accepted - Issue 64 is opened.

Resolution: Issue 64 is opened

**Issue 65** Where can interaction intents be attached? Where can implementation intents be attached?

http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-65

Ashok moves to Open Issue 65
Sanjay seconds

Motion is accepted. Issue 65 is opened.

Resolution: Issue 65 is opened

**Issue 66: Tighten XML Schema for Intent Definition**

Dave Booz: http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-66

Ashok explains the rationale for Issue 66

Ashok moves to Open Issue 66
Sanjay seconds

Motion is accepted - Issue 66 is opened.

Resolution: Issue 66 is opened

**(Item 8) Existing Issues**

**ISSUE-62: RFC2119 text updates**

http://www.osoa.org/jira/browse/POLICY-62

Proposal:

Dave: I have reviewed it and I have some changes that are needed, but have not yet had time to do the updates

Ashok: This issue would be a good item for the F2F

Dave: Look at CD01-Rev13

....there is a chapter on Reliability policy - Ch 8 in Rev13

...there are no normative statements in that chapter

Mike E: that section has the word "guarantees" all over it - isn't that equivalent to "MUST"
Issue Status Reporting - for Liaison Committee

6 open issues
3 opened today
0 closed today

AOB

Next meeting 28th Jan F2F
Close of Business