

GGF9 OGSA-WG Core Services Session  
Oct. 07 2003, 6:00-7:30pm Sheraton 4  
Attendees: 60  
Minutes: Ravi Subramaniam, Andreas Savva

### **OGSA (Jay Unger)**

Presented the core services.

Core = common  
Everything not in PE & Data

### **Security (Frank Siebenlist)**

Presentation on security

### **OGSA-Sec-WG (Marty Humphrey)**

Security Architecture for Open Grid Services  
Security Roadmap

Need security to be wire and service oriented.  
Enumerate and address the capabilities that are required (esp. if other Web efforts don't deliver)  
Base many of the building blocks on the Argonne-IBM discussion.

Most of the Grid security discussion is WS-\*. All of the WS boxes have appeared except WS-authorization.  
Identified the OGSA AuthZ WG (here is the primary focus)

Will use the IBM-MS model and then add WS-Agreement.

Reacting to SAML and XACML.

WS-\* is now WSS in OASIS. All the specs (right now proto specs) are visible right now. Need IBM-MS-Verisign to sign off before this is made public.

WS-\* is risky given that these are proprietary until released. There needed to be an active engagement with the authorities developing the spec. WS-\* is not a required part of the OGSA security architecture. (See foils for details). Currently the security WG is short-handed and decided to focus on authorizations.

- Is the layered diagram similar to IBM/MS one?
  - o Identical
- Besides WS-security nothing else is done in OASIS?
  - o Expect that they will be submitted eventually. (raj)

- Don't want to unnecessarily duplicate work (so we need to track/evaluate what exists). but are not locked into these. (marty)
  - Becoming more public; expect to be standardized but take time. (jay)
- Why was something proprietary chosen? (ravi)
  - Understood intention was for things to move in oasis.
    - <someone with conflicting confidential info>
  - Mechanism to make things faster (standardization) is to press suppliers to provide them.
  - Nothing cast in stone; can always move to something else.
- Monitor & meanwhile make whatever progress can be made (authz)
- Note that the actual "cast-in-stone" map does not reference any WS-\* specs. Talks in terms of functionalities. (Raj)
- Why hasn't much progress been made?
  - Limited number of people (same group of 10 people or so)
  - Picked authorization because there exist a number of good works that could profitably be standardized.
- Was OGSA going to do anything on firewall interoperability?
  - No. This was probably firewall traversal (frank)
- Not everything is based on soap; is work still applicable then?
  - any transport/binding is ok; don't even require xml.
  - Others mentioned were IPSec, SSL

### **OGSA-Security AZ (Von Welch)**

Currently the volunteers available focusing on X.509 and SAML. No porttypes expected for attributes and policy.

It is SDE based so is OGS/GGF specific.

### **Resource Usage Service (RUS-WG) (Bill Horn)**

Two track: tactical (get something running) and strategic (integrate into the OGSA effort) track

Have use cases and scenarios to help drive the effort.

Resource Usage service has to be factored into the other services that will be in OGSA. There is a mesh between these services.

How does this relate to the GESA working group? The resource usage services would determine by the RU service and then this would feed to GESA for billing.

RUS was formed in context of UR (data) & GESA (consumer)

The WG are trying to stay resource model agnostic and defer to the other efforts like DMTF, SMTP, CIM. Do we need our own model? Is a crowded space with DMTF and OASIS. We need a strong owner in GGF.

The authorization is to be content specific. It is an issues and mechanisms requiring this have to be developed and it is expected to defer to the security.

### **Usage Record Working Group (UR-WG)**

Common standard to exchange usage information. Collect information on resource usage. Single standard to collect and disseminate usage information.

Out of scope: is how to collect the data and how to use this data.

The reference use case is a multi-site. E.g., a couple of sites that require exchange of usage information. The mapping of difference in the scale and units of measurements are to be resolved by a policy manager. Need to support multiple types of resources. TerraGrid and SIPG are participating in defining the compute and non-compute resources. As of version 1.0 this will support the accounting and research states. Has a concept of local and global states.

Documents were submitted (Sep 2003) and will be released for 60 day comment. 3 documents are usage record survey (accounting sites and production monitoring); Accounting Interchange define for example what a CPU and CPU hour is (lexicon for the XML record format)

Usage record group has met its goal.

Need to extent to Network resource (for example: bandwidth reservation area; utilization; delay etc. Many other issues did not show in the early in the discussion and need other metrics to be defined).

Need to use this in Grid accounting (TeraGrid is limited in scope to evaluate all the dimensions)

Improved usage collection and more sources for collection

Need mechanism to resolve different standards across the different sites and reconcile the differences.

Ravi question:

How do the handle in-band and out-of-band resource usage (is there is difference)?

The framework will support the usage based on the agents that are monitoring and determining the usage.