GGF9 OGSA-WG Platform Session

Oct. 08 2003, 10:00-11:30am Sheraton 4

Attendees: 68

Minutes: Fred Maciel, Ravi Subramaniam

(Merge: Andreas Savva)

Overview by Dave Snelling

- **Presentation by Fred Maciel on OGSA service classifications**
    - (same presentation given in the first OGSA-WG session)
    - Discussion on history and service taxonomy (user view)
    - Discussion on visual aspect and the OGSA hierarchy (relationship hierarchy) – provider view
    - Discussion on the candidates for platform services
    - Questions:
        - None.

- **Presentation by Fred Maciel on the relationship between CMM-WG and OGSA-WG.**
    - Explanation of the mission of CMM-WG: manageability within OGSA
    - CMM has been closely involved in OGSA and vice versa; first WG to be spawned by OGSA-WG.
    - Explanation of the original target of the WG: the manageability foundation of OGSA, providing functionalities of broad and general use for management (base interface into a resource, lifecycle, relationships, generic portTypes, etc.). Showed its position on the service hierarchy.
        - CMM-WG session on the previous day decided to move this work to OASIS WSDM TC (with work done by common member in both groups). Expectation for one single spec and more functionality than in separate specs.
    - Explained new (temporary) work of the CMM-WG: to do a gap analysis between what exists in management space and what Grid needs, and let the resulting work drive the next steps. This work is similar to what the OGSA mission is, just restricted to manageability, therefore related to OGSA-WG.
        - Comment by David Snelling: "sub-group of OGSA-WG".
        - Probably need larger services management infrastructure with OGSA
        - May need a generic model beyond CMM to handle these new factored services that are being introduced.
    - Questions/Comments:

- ♦ Lowest level in the platform is OGSI and there is a shared membership with OGSA and CMM. Keep track of what is not working with OGSI and continue to drive.
- ♦ Ravi: General manageability is important in every service. Is there a synergy in thinking that CMM may need to merge with OGSI or rather OGSI provide the infrastructure basis for CMM?

- **Presentation by Karan Bhatia (SDSC) of the OGSA-P2P RG.**
  - Focus of RG is traditional P2P: distributed computing, file sharing, etc.
  - Why care? Where are the synergies?
    - ♦ Many Grid features are getting P2P functionality
    - ♦ P2P technologies are suited to grid
      - For scalability and performance
      - Group manageability (like JXTA) can be leveraged
    - ♦ Instant messaging is an important capability to be merged into the Grid to provide presence notification
    - ♦ Lots of P2P technologies (distributed hash tables, overlay networks, etc) that are suitable as core OGSI / OGSA functionality
  - Producing requirements document, complete draft by the end of November
    - ♦ Have already submitted use cases to OGSA
    - ♦ Requirements may apply to other Grid areas too.
    - ♦ Requirements:
      - scalability (number of devices is very high),
      - autonomic manageability,
      - connectivity (non-uniform environment with hindrances such as NATs, etc.),
      - security (peers don't trust each other), sandboxing, reputation based systems,
      - resource variability (machines, networks and other resources come and go, so component "reliability" is low),
      - locality and interactivity (important for P2P content delivery),
      - group support – helps data management area too.
    - ♦ Questions:
      - "Can one build P2P apps on the Grid?" Answer is generally yes, but the infrastructure doesn't help yet. So hope to feedback requirements to OGSA. Grids are increasingly looking like P2P.
      - (Ian): It seems that some OGSI aspects (soft state lifetime, introspection, notification) would be useful? A: Some aspects can be leveraged, but there

are also additional requirements in the list above. WS have been looked at for P2P but there is little traction.

- (Alan Weissberger): In the workshop yesterday many differences were mentioned (Grid is centralized vs distributed, different infrastructure), but today's presentation mentions synergies. Is that contradictory, or something you would like to see? A: Something we would like to see. Ian: we are starting to see this (in deployments with large number of sites, machines, files).
- (Ravi): There is a middle ground: grids need to move away from centralized mechanisms. Perhaps they are trying to meet in the middle. A: Yes, there is a continuum.

- **Presentation by Dejan Milojicic (HP) of the APPAGG RG.**
  - Appliance aggregation WG looking at how to aggregate small footprint devices.
  - Two use cases to be submitted to OGSA:
    - ◆ Mobile enterprise users (ease of use, zero configuration, ad-hoc aggregation, how to define trust boundaries and maintain ease of use, ad-hoc connect)
    - ◆ Medical use case (mobility – medical staff require quick access to information while moving around in their environment, connection and disconnection)
  - Common issues: lightweight, exposing devices or not, where does P2P comes in (on top of OGSA, or P2P implementation of services?)

- **OGSA-WG future plans**
  - Next steps
    - ◆ OGSA use case doc: final call at GGF10
    - ◆ OGSA document: good progress since GGF8, update at GGF10, perhaps final call at GGF11
    - ◆ Cross-WG sessions again at GGF10 (perhaps more WGs or deeper discussions)
    - ◆ F2F meetings
    - ◆ Weekly teleconferences
    - ◆ Spin off WG: logging system BoF planned for GGF10
  - Additional documents contemplated
    - ◆ Roadmap document (perhaps first draft for GGF10)
      - David: anybody opposed? No.
    - ◆ Primer document (not clear if needed).
      - Jay explains that given the nature of the OGSA document there is less need for a primer.

- David: a primer captures the decision-making process behind the spec, but the use case document does a part of that.
- Ravi: Having an annotated document would be the proper way to do it, but some people need to look at a document that explains OGSA in a simple way.
- David: if the non-normative text gets too big, this could be true.

– Call to action

– Other discussions

♦ OGSA branding explanation
- WG group should be based on the OGSI.
- Their work fit into the architecture as discussed in the OGSA document.
- Actively interact with OGSA-WG.
- Use OGSA as an adjective.
- Comment from David: OGSA doesn't have the authority for that. The GFSC has sole control over the namespace.

♦ Define a procedure for spawning sub-WGs and GGF WGs
- Comment from David: This is (can only be) an informal procedure.