

OGSA Basic Execution Service Working Group

Global Grid Forum, SRM Area

Charter

Administrative Information

Name and Acronym:

OGSA-BES

Chairs:

Andrew Grimshaw	University of Virginia
Steve Newhouse	University of Southampton
Darren Pulsipher	Ovoca

Secretary(s)/Webmaster(s) (both optional):

Email list:

OGSA-BES-WG@ggf.org

Web page:

<http://forge.ggf.org/projects/ogsa-bes-wg>

Charter

Focus/Purpose

The OGSA Execution Management Services (EMS) design team has developed as part of the OGSA V1 document a draft set of EMS services to support a wide range of use-cases. The objective of the OGSA-BES working group is to focus on a minimal sub-set of the EMS services and develop a recommendations document (i.e., specification) for them. The working group will work closely with the WG/RGs within GGF, e.g. OGSA WG, JSDL WG, SAGA RG, GRAAP WG and also widely used pioneering projects; e.g. Globus, UNICORE, Condor, Legion, Platform, SGE, PBS, OMII, and others as appropriate. Of particular importance is the interaction with the OGSA-WG. The OGSA-BES will have a review meeting (possibly on the phone) before document publications.

The milestones are particularly ambitious in order to support the overall OGSA roadmap and timeline. Fortunately there has already been significant discussion with the OGSA-WG on the overall EMS architecture, as well as discussions with other interested parties such as OMII and EGEE.

Scope

The scope of the working group is on the definition of services for service instantiation and management. For example, using the OGSA V1 nomenclature, service containers and jobs. Further, the definitions of services, meta-data, protocols, etc., will be defined in terms of OGSA profiles.

Goals

Deliverable/Milestone 1: *BOF – March 2005, Korea.* *Done!*
Deliverable/Milestone 2: Draft recommendation document, June 2005.
Deliverable/Milestone 3: Draft experience documents, September, 2005.
Deliverable/Milestone 4: Recommendation document ready for public review, October, 2005.
Deliverable/Milestone 5: Final recommendation document, late Spring, 2006.

...

Management Issues

The working group will have teleconferences at least every other week, and will have face-to-face meetings between GGF meetings.

Evidence of commitments to carry out WG tasks

Several of the interested parties have already committed to seeing this through. UVA, UK e-Sciences, Globus, NAREGI, Platform, SGE, and others have agreed to participate.

Pre-existing Document(s) (if any)

There are a number of existing documents. The OGSA V1 document describes an execution management architecture. Subsequent draft, internal OGSA documents have renamed some terms to eliminate jargon confusion (https://forge.gridforum.org/projects/ogsa-wg/document/EMS_Actors_and_Solutions/en/1) as well as a first pass at narrowing the scope for Basic Execution Services (https://forge.gridforum.org/projects/ogsa-wg/document/Basic_EMS_Services/en/1).

Exit Strategy

When the recommendation document is complete and has passed through necessary public comment and editor review, the working group will be dissolved.

Any other relevant information

The Seven Questions

1. Is the scope of the proposed group sufficiently focused?

The working group is focused on a single aspect of OGSA Execution Management Services.

2. Are the topics that the group plans to address clear and relevant for the Grid research, development, industrial, implementation, and/or application user community?

Yes. Scientific compute grids depend on the capability to start “jobs” and services.

3. Will the formation of the group foster (consensus-based) work that would not be done otherwise?

Yes.

4. Do the group's activities overlap inappropriately with those of another GGF group or to a group active in another organization such as IETF or W3C?

No. The group will work closely with WG/RGs within GGF, e.g. OGSA WG, JSDL WG, SAGA RG, GRAAP WG and also widely used pioneering projects; e.g. Globus, UNICORE, Condor, Legion, Platform, SGE, PBS, OMII, and others as appropriate.

5. Are there sufficient interest and expertise in the group's topic, with at least several people willing to expend the effort that is likely to produce significant results over time?

Yes. The people involved have done implementations of this type of service in the past. Further, there are commitments and interest from many members of the OGSA. Finally, the group members have a history on delivering on software and documents.

6. Does a base of interested consumers (e.g., application developers, Grid system implementers, industry partners, end-users) appear to exist for the planned work?

Yes. This includes the UK e-Sciences community, several companies, as well as grid researchers in the United States and Japan.

7. Does the GGF have a reasonable role to play in the determination of the technology?

Yes. This work does not fall into W3C, or OASIS (though it could be argued that anything fits in OASIS), or IETF. There is a relationship between the WSDM work and this work though – primarily in terms of schema.