

# Grid Resource Allocation Agreement Protocol

GRAAP-WG working session #1  
Friday, 15 July, 2011  
Salt Lake City, USA

# OGF IPR Policies Apply

- "I acknowledge that participation in this meeting is subject to the OGF Intellectual Property Policy."
- **Intellectual Property Notices Note Well:** All statements related to the activities of the OGF and addressed to the OGF are subject to all provisions of Appendix B of GFD-C.1, which grants to the OGF and its participants certain licenses and rights in such statements. Such statements include verbal statements in OGF meetings, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:
  - the OGF plenary session,
  - any OGF working group or portion thereof,
  - the OGF Board of Directors, the GFSG, or any member thereof on behalf of the OGF,
  - the ADCOM, or any member thereof on behalf of the ADCOM,
  - any OGF mailing list, including any group list, or any other list functioning under OGF auspices,
  - the OGF Editor or the document authoring and review process
- Statements made outside of a OGF meeting, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an OGF activity, group or function, are not subject to these provisions.
- Excerpt from Appendix B of GFD-C.1: "Where the OGF knows of rights, or claimed rights, the OGF secretariat shall attempt to obtain from the claimant of such rights, a written assurance that upon approval by the GFSG of the relevant OGF 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 OGF 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 OGF Secretariat, and made available. The GFSG may also direct that a summary of the results be included in any GFD published containing the specification."
- OGF Intellectual Property Policies are adapted from the IETF Intellectual Property Policies that support the Internet Standards Process.

# GRAAP Sessions at OGF32

July 15, Location: Salon E

- Session 1 09:00 – 10:30 Group discussion on the state of the group, recent activities, comments received for WS-Agreement Negotiation spec, working on spec.  
(this session)
- Session 2 11:00 – 12:30 Working on term languages
- Session 3 11:00 – 12:30 RESTful rendering for WS-Agreement

# Agenda

- Welcome
- Update since OGF31
- State of the WG
- Comments received for WS-Agreement Negotiation during public comment period
- Implementing the public comments on WS-Agreement Negotiation
- Next steps

# Update since last OGF (1)

- Revised version of GFD.107 waiting to be published along with WS-Agreement Negotiation
- Revised version obsoletes GFD.107 and will be assigned a new GFD number
- WS-Agreement Negotiation in public comment
- Finished working on initial versions of
  - a number of term languages and
  - a set of KPIs

# State of WSAG Negotiation spec



- In public comment period from March 15 to May 15
- 6 comments received
- Mostly typos, questions for clarification, a few suggestions for changing wording
  - no fundamental issues raised

# WSAG Negotiation spec

- First comment on misc (Toshi):
  - Thank you very much for making this standard.  
Please find below some editorial comments.  
(I wish I could take time to do a detailed check)  
BR  
Toshi
  - P1.  
WS-Agreement Negotiation provides an  
additional layer when creating agreements with WS-Agreement is using an  
extensible XML language for specifying the nature of the agreement offers,  
and agreement templates to facilitate discovery of compatible agreement  
parties and ease the process of creating valid agreement offers.  
  
=> Cpuld you be more succinct wrt this statement which is rather bizzar (from  
non native English speaker..)

# WSAG Negotiation spec

- First comment (continued):
  - P4.  
This problem leads to a situation in which  
service consumers do not only have functional requirements for a service, but  
also demands regarding to the non-functional service properties, such as the  
average response time of a service, the service availability, or the average  
recovery time in case of failure.  
  
also demands => also demand
  - P11.  
This offer is then send=>  
This offer is then sent
  - P11.  
After the negotiation responder received the initial negotiation offer  
  
=>received=>receives



# WSAG Negotiation spec

- First comment (continued):
  - P11-12  
This offer is again send to the negotiation responder that decides that this particular offer is unacceptable.  
  
=>send=>sent
  - P13.  
Figure 3: Different views on the negotiation process. An offer send by one negotiation participant is a counter offer to a previously received negotiation offer.

An offer send by=> An offer sent by

# WSAG Negotiation spec

- Second comment on misc (Oliver):
  - 7.5.4 (page 38) Resource Property  
wsag-neg:NegotiationOfferTemplate is called  
wsag-neg:NegotiationTemplate in the subsequent text and in the WSDL file.  
The property name should be wsag-neg:NegotiableTemplate.
  - The cardinality (minOccurs, maxOccurs) is not specified in the WSDL. It should be  
minOccurs="0" and maxOccurs="unbounded" (0..n as specified in 7.5.4)
  - The spelling of NegotiableTemplate is wrong in the WSDL and XML schema file

# WSAG Negotiation spec

- Third comment on Negotiation Offer State Transitions (Kassidy):

- Hello everyone,  
Overall, we're very satisfied with the current state of the document. In typical GRAAPian fashion, the layout, figures and content are very clear and well presented.

With specific regard to the state machine (which has been a source of confusion and disagreement), I think the examples and illustrations shown in 5.4 make the acceptable state transitions very clear. My compliments go to the author of this section (I assume Oliver?).

Just a small thing, but please replace "on the base of" with "on the basis of" throughout the document.

We are planning an implementation for second half of this year, so I'm sure we'll have more comments after that. =)

Kind regards,  
Kassidy

# WSAG Negotiation spec

- Fourth comment on offer expiration (Iblasi)

- Thank you for this standard proposal.

My main comment is that the Offer/CounterOffer state transition diagram should take into account that an offer can expire.

Kind regards,

Lorenzo

PS: a small thing on spelling: please replace "costumer" with "customer" :)

# WSAG Negotiation spec

- Fifth comment (hrasheed)

- Thanks for making this proposal.

This standard proposal seems to be effective and useful, and the draft implementation of WS-Negotiation in WSAG4J framework is being used in our licensing solution for negotiating the software licenses. A nice separation of WS-Negotiation specification from WS-Agreement makes very easy to integrate WS-Negotiation in our existing WS-Agreement based implementation.

Best regards.....

# WSAG Negotiation spec

- Sixth comment (Karim)

- Hi Wolfgang,

Sorry for the delay in getting back to you.

The document reads well, is concise and sound. I enjoyed reading it!

Here are some comments:

- Page 1. Delete [provides an additional layer when creating agreements with WS-Agreement] as it is duplicated
  - Page 4, Introduction section, typical example. Negotiation is seen as taking place pre "service execution" whereas re-negotiation is likely to take place during the service execution. Do we want to make that clearer?

It is important that the provision of symmetric and asymmetric protocol is there (page 6). If the negotiation process is driven by a client (service requestor) and an agreement is created, then the re-negotiation process may be driven by either parties: the client or the service provider. In the situation where the service provider is initiating the re-negotiation it needs the means to do so (this is well explained in section 7).

# WSAG Negotiation spec

- Sixth comment (continued)
  - Page 6, requirements. Is the number of re-negotiations limited or not? Can either party request a re-negotiation at any time? is this clearly specified in the negotiation context?
  - Page 11, section 3.1, last paragraph. The offer is then [sent] to the negotiation responder ...
  - End of page 11 - Start of Page 12. This offer is again [sent] to the negotiation responder ...
  - Page 18. in /wsag-neg:NegotiationType/wsag-neg:Renegotiation, needs to clearly differentiate between symmetric and asymmetric layouts.

# WSAG Negotiation spec

- Sixth comment (

- Page 33, Figure 10. There is an arrow Advertise(offer) from the negotiation initiator. What does the negotiation responder return? In the same figure, one would expect to see the following:

loop ...

- Negotiate(offers)

- CounterOffers

...

followed by

- CreateAgreement(offer, negotiationExtensionDocument)

- AgreementEPR

Am I right to think that at the last round of the loop Negotiate(offers) is followed on the negotiation initiator side by

CounterOffers + CreateAgreement(offer, negotiationExtensionDocument)

and not directly by

CreateAgreement(offer, negotiationExtensionDocument)?

- Page 33, section 7.3, line 8. as soon [as] a new ...

Hope this helps,

Best wishes.

Karim