

GRAAP-WG Sessions

OGF 20, Manchester, UK
May 7, 2007

GGF Intellectual Property Policy



All statements related to the activities of the GGF and addressed to the GGF are subject to all provisions of Appendix B of GFD-C.1, which grants to the GGF and its participants certain licenses and rights in such statements. Such statements include verbal statements in GGF meetings, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to any GGF working group or portion thereof,

Where the GFSG knows of rights, or claimed rights, the GGF secretariat shall attempt to obtain from the claimant of such rights, a written assurance that upon approval by the GFSG of the relevant GGF document(s), any party will be able to obtain the right to implement, use and distribute the technology or works when implementing, using or distributing technology based upon the specific specification(s) under openly specified, reasonable, non-discriminatory terms. The working group or research group proposing the use of the technology with respect to which the proprietary rights are claimed may assist the GGF secretariat in this effort. The results of this procedure shall not affect advancement of document, except that the GFSG may defer approval where a delay may facilitate the obtaining of such assurances. The results will, however, be recorded by the GGF Secretariat, and made available. The GFSG may also direct that a summary of the results be included in any GFD published containing the specification.

Sessions planned



- GRAAP #1, May 7, 09:00 am - 10:30 am
 - State of the spec, last changes, implementations
- GRAAP #2, May 7, 11:00 am - 12:30 am
 - Implementation/Interoperability issue discussion
- GRAAP #3, May 7, 02:00 pm - 3:30 pm
 - Negotiation

Agenda GRAAP #1



- State of the spec
- Last changes before submission (Toshi Nakata, 20 min)
- Implementation
 - VIOLA Implementation (Oliver Wäldrich, 20 min)
 - AssessGrid: SLA structure & GT4 implementation issue (Dominic Battre, 20 min)
- Discussion of features not considered in WS-Agreement V1.0

State of the spec



- Final version of the spec submitted to the GFSG
- GFSG accepted the spec on May, 6

Features useful for later versions of the spec



- SLOs depend on ServiceProperties which depend on SDTs
 - JSDL useful for # CPUs, bandwidth, etc., not for response time, CPU usage etc.
 - Ariel: GSA-RG work could be used, should be investigated, continue discussion at GSA-RG session (Wednesday, May 9, 06:00 pm , Exchange 2/3)
 - Extension for JSDL for qualitative metrics
- Define application domains for SLAs, use cases
 - Omer use case from markets
 - Oliver/Dominic: scheduling & RMS use-case, brokering
 - To be ready before OGF 21
- Repository for SLA templates used in different projects
- Paul Strong (co-chair of reference model, eBay) defining terms for use in OGSA -> to be contacted
- Creation constraints: evaluation of XPATH expressions when using SOAP messages
- Monitoring: how to verify SLAs? Not a topic to be resolved in GRAAP, but could provide hints.

Agenda GRAAP #2



- Implementation/Interoperability discussion
 - Hosting environment issues (recommendation?)
 - Interoperability activities started
- Scenarios/use cases for dynamic SLAs and negotiation

- WSRF (base faults, resource properties) and WS Addressing are critical: different versions & different support in hosting environments
 - Name spaces are different
- Level of interoperability to achieve?
 - Schema level, minimal set of terms for “hello world”
 - create document describing the interoperability scenarios that will be submitted to the OGF document process. Structure & outline should be ready after OGF20
 - Oliver, Wolfgang, Dominic, Omer -> time tbd in the break after GRAAP #3
- GT4 expected to migrate to the newest version of WSRF & WS Addressing, but no schedule available on the website -> contact Globus Alliance people during OGF20
- Template generation
 - Repository or dynamic on demand
 - How to create an ID for a template from a repository -> static ID

Implementation/interoperability discussion II



- Similarities in the AssessGrid and VIOLA implementation could be used for first tests on the functional aspects, SORMA to contribute
 - SDTs in common? Based on JSDL, should work, guarantee terms however are completely different
- BEinGrid: most probably based on (modified) WS-Agreement
- NextGRID: similar protocol but different language
- TrustCom
- GridTrust
- →Organize a telephone conference with these projects, after restructuring the Google document (see http://docs.google.com/Doc?id=dd2wwjk8_0d7b58b)

Use-cases for dynamic SLAs and negotiation



- Q1: How to create Agreements to minimize negotiation (e.g. using constraints, functions) needed to converge?
- Q2: How to re-negotiate an existing agreement, both client and provider driven? → Could become difficult when there are conflicting parties. Probably dependent on the “cost” of re-negotiation.
- Optimistic and pessimistic scenarios, recovering from failure or offering more service to the user
- SLAs for optimizing flops per watt (evolving use case: Intel study, SwissGrid)
- Q: Are dynamic SLAs useful? → In a Grid with some economic model below: Yes
- If not all requirements could be fulfilled during the initial creation of the SLA and the service provider later has additional resources/capabilities
- Network providers: Ipsphere plans to use OGSA protocols, WSRF, objective: automatic negotiation of SLAs
- OGSA session on SLTs for BytelO and BES 4pm
- To start work on negotiation begin with Q1) and extend to Q2) later
- Creation constraints to indicate fixed/negotiable terms
- Provide protocols for bilateral negotiation to select from
- Q: Survey on protocols? → Shamima will send a paper form 2002
- Toshi to provide a very simple micro spec for Q2)
- Omer to provide something on Q1) after OGF21

- Negotiation
 - Performance comparison between a 3 phases and a 2 phases negotiation protocol (Antoine Pichot, 20 min)
 - Akogrimo negotiation framework (NN, 20 min)
 - AssessGrid Negotiation Scenarios in AssessGrid and implications for negotiation procedures (Dominic Battre, 20 min)
 - Implementing negotiation protocols in Ontogrid (Shamima Paurobally, 20 min)

Negotiation approaches I



- Antoine: Performance comparison ... VIOLA (2PC) & Negotiation protocol
Olivers presented during OGF18 (3PC)
- Dominic: Negotiation scenarios in AssessGrid
 - Scenario 1: User-Provider negotiation: no commit by the client when sending the templates, because the service provider fixes the price only afterwards
 - Scenario 2: Broker is mediator
 - Scenario 3: Broker is contractor
- Implications
 - 1) commit message is needed
 - 2) no need to commit for the user
 - drawback: WS-AG returns only one offer template, which is not sufficient
 - offers need expiration time, but how to handle clocks and failure in a distributed system
 - templates should be similar/identical to be handled by the broker, may not depend on user
 - 3) needs to be communicated
 - Discussion of 2PC and the impossibility to have it work properly
 - agreed on uncertainty of model due to timing problem
 - Dean: same effect can be achieved with simpler protocol

Negotiation approaches II



- Shamima: Ontogrid's negotiation service
 - Based on English auction, auctioneer & bidders, deadline
 - Integration on WS-Agreement? Translating SpeechAct to WS-Agreement

Interoperability/implementation



- Scenario document has to be an informational one that undergoes public comment period
- Telco on the document Friday February 16, 15:30 - to be published to the GRAAP list
- State of the CREMONA implementation to be checked by Jean Pierre Prost
- Industrial use case from the reliability and robustness workshop
 - How industry uses penalty clauses
- Negotiation part of WS-Agreement?
 - Negotiation profiles seem to be a solution (QoS BoF this afternoon)
 - Omer to participate
 - Are there use cases from this group?
- Discuss scenario document with HPC profile group
 - Potential to include one profile with WS-Agreement + JSDL
- TerraGrid use cases for negotiation, e.g. co-allocation, offer+counteroffer

Current/planned Implementations



- VIOLA MSS
- CATNETS
- University of Munich (Tianchao)
- University of Georgia (semantic issues with SLAs)
- CREMONA (state?)
- CSS Resource Management System/Scheduler (planned)
- PHOSPHORUS (planned)
- SORMA (planned)
- G-Lambda (probably)