CMM-WG GGF12 minutes

September 22, 2004

1 Administrative matters

- Presented GGF IPR policy
- Passed the attendance list (attendance: 21 people)
- Note taker for minutes: Fred Maciel

2 Background and Future Plans

- Presented background, current status and future plans of the CMM-WG

3 Free discussion

- Relationship with SNIA? What does SNIA have? Protocols, profiles, CIM (recommending model extensions for CIM) mentioned. Some discussion.
- Is CIM enough or should there be other models involved in OGSA?
  - Andrea Westerinen: It's not either/or CIM. CIM was made to unify all them. Fred: have to consider other models such as Glue, etc. Andrea: Glue maps well to CIM.
  - Andrew Grimshaw: We don't have a quorum for the OGSA-WG, it's not possible to say here that we [OGSA-WG] will only do CIM.
  - Abdslem: possible to create profiles dynamically in CIM? Andrea: similar things are possible, but have just not been done.
  - Igor Sedukhin: we only gain interoperability through XML. UML or text is good enough for interoperability. Andrea and Jay Unger disagree: same for private MIBs in SNMP, it's standard SNMP, but one cannot understand each other. Tom Studwell: metadata exchange must be out of band. Andrew: agree with Igor that there needs to have flexibility to add things to schema. Andrea, Tom Studwell: yes, CIM allows that (extensions exist, but are not interoperable).
  - CIM compliant means that everything has to be in the model? Andrea: no, CIM gives you a predictable structure via inheritance to create your extensions. Andrew: arbitrary extensions? Andrea: there are good and bad extensions.
  - Difference between Tom Studwell and Igor? Igor: if I create something how do I extend it? Tom Studwell: profiles guide how it is done (values, operations, and interactions in SNIA). Karl Schopmeyer: it probably starts from a known place in the model, even if it's industry-specific and other people extend it, you still have common things that they can use.

- – Igor: you are proposing top-down, but it does not always work (grass-roots approach). Andrea: you start with what you care about, but then can you fit it back in CIM? That depends on what you want to solve.
- Tom Studwell, bringing original subject back: what does it mean to base on CIM? See the models to see what fits into your stuff? Andrea comments on area experts. Andrew: still worried about "all". Jay: it's like the discussion on core Web services, I want to get on to build real Grid services, I don't want to re-model things, as long as it is extensible, I'm willing to live with it so I can get on with it.
  - – Igor: so it is "recommended to use CIM but other not precluded"? Jay: not allowed to create overlaps.
- Tom Roney: GGF and DMTF have collaboration agreement, but are we discussing collaborating? Jay: discussing how to. Tom Roney: Extend CIM to be Grid-enabled. If we have CIM everywhere we can see the relationships.
- Hiro Kishimoto: understand that CIM is good and extendable, but what we want to do is virtualization, not specify detailed information, i.e., we want to hide detailed information. Not sure if CIM is suitable for OGSA. Andrea: detail is in CIM only for when someone needs it. Normally you manage on the high level, and go down if something goes wrong. Hiro: storage profile spec has 600 pages, it is quite complex. Tony Rodriguez: it defines the virtualization. Most of it is how to use the model. Hiro: but Grid models are simple. Tom Studwell: because they don't consider everything. Andrea: NM-WG model's is getting bigger and bigger, including even server and OSs; when it's complete it will be the size of CIM. Larry: you don't have to go to the gory details in the first step. Details can be added later.
- Jay: no question that the collaboration between GGF and CIM will require core modeling adjustments, it will add high-level concepts. If both sides of the contract are OK, that's OK. One of the things that allows my spec to stay small is that I can reference another spec, and it's potentially a small set of the whole spec that is being referred. Having this body of work allows us to simplify our work.
- Andrew: as long as we are doing hypothetical is difficult, we have to begin doing concrete things. Start by the data stuff.
- Igor: all concerns on CIM go to CGS-WG? CGS: no, CGS-WG won't solve all problems of GGF. Other WGs collaborate with DMTF directly. CDDLM didn't have to go through CGS-WG, but CGS-WG keeps track.
- Igor: Suppose I want to make a Monte Carlo simulation manageable. How do I do this? Andrea explains generic features for manageability. Other features are functional. Igor: statistics? Andrea: subclass from CIM statistical data.
- Fred: will have to make a final all-or-nothing decision? Larry: Final conclusion was suggestion: start trying with e.g., EMS. Andrew: things are still flexible now.