

GGF12 September 2004 GRAAP Session #1

Note takers: Philipp, Kate, Alain, Wolfgang

GGF IPR Statement presented

Agenda of Session #1 & #2 introduced

Presentation of "How to use WS-Agreement" by Alain, see slides.

Questions concerning the presentation:

- Difference between an agreement document and an offer? Alain explains.
- wsag:All, wsag:OneOrMore and wsag:ExactlyOne. Why no wsag:ZeroOrMore? - If not possible, please report this to the mailing list.
- Why termination time part of the context? - Refers to GridService termination time, must be clarified.
- How do I know whether service terms agreed upon are really fulfilled? Need for a monitoring service? - Kate: No, one should rely to provider/consumer trust relationship.
- How to treat an agreement dependent on other agreements. Imagine A dependent on B dependent on C, and C is becoming invalid. - Two models discussed: implicit dependencies & explicit dependencies.
- GRAAP should have a repository for case studies, use cases, etc.
- Job Submission Context slide (initiator is service consumer) can be used for bidding scenarios...
Open issue: consumer is initiator tag - do we need it?
- Discussion on service consumer & provider, agreement provider & initiator roles. What about an entity trusted by parties involved in the process to host an agreement? We would then have 5 roles instead of four now: Initiator/Consumer, Agreement Provider/Service Provider, and Agreement Host
May be useful for brokering, third party inspection... - Topic to be discussed on the list.

Further questions & discussion:

- Q: Inspection of agreement by other entities? - A: Dependent on provider policy.
- Necessity of dependencies of agreements stated for co-allocation and work flow processing use cases.
- Composition of agreements is an issue to be solved by the GRAAP group, needed by different projects (e.g. Triana , EGEE).
- Event-based claim of agreements discussed.
- GRAAP would like to have implementations, pointers to work dealing with WS Agreement, use case documents..., preferably in the context of the specification.
- Are there any implementations? - A: Yes, Juelich, FhG, NEC, Argonne plan to implement parts of it. People from the audience think that implementation of the whole spec. is not necessary for every usage scenario. EGEE thinks about implementing the whole spec.
- GRAAP use case requirements documents, status? - A: There is one used to drive the protocol development, before WS Agreement. Kate had usage/interoperability scenarios in mind; this document does not yet exist.
Conclusion: GRRAP should have precise use-cases as well as interoperability scenarios to justify EVERY feature, because we have a form of "function creep".
- Q: To what extent does WS Agreement require WSRF? - It is explicitly used in the spec.

GGF12 September 2004 GRAAP Session #2

Note takers: Philipp, Kate, Alain, Wolfgang

GGF IPR Statement presented

First presentation by Toshiyuki: "Questions/Comments on WS Agreement", see slides

- Q: Use case 1, assure that services are located on same host: can variables be used that way? - A: Yes
- Use case 2, related agreement problems: Several related agreements in the process, how to refer to other Services in another agreements? Is it possible to give wsag:Name to wsag:RelatedAgreement? - Discussion: Do we need to increase scope of ServiceName to go across agreements, not just within an agreement? This is asked by Toshiyuki, EGEE has the same problem. Alain: I am not sure this is needed because I don't think having an agreement refer to parts of another is needed or is an adequate use of the spec. In the broker-type use case presented by Toshiyuki, I think the facade agreement provider should decide of (and possibly hide) the decomposition of the facade agreement into other agreements with parties in the third tier of the architecture.
- Use case 3, composition scenario: Is some kind of work flow logic needed? - A: Looks like yes, see discussion yesterday.
- Use case 3, Integration of related agreements into other agreements: Is this foreseen in the spec.? - A: There is no construct for sub-agreements yet. Alain: Shouldn't we express requirements on dependencies on other agreements as SDTs instead of in the Context? We might as well get rid of related agreements.
- Lots of this relates to composition of agreements, something which has not been discussed in detail in GRAAP. A proposal does exist; maybe the priority has to be increased within the group.
- Question to Toshiyuki: Do you see any difference between business and scientific kind of jobs? - A: Lots of an agreement is domain-specific which may suggest put this kind of specificity into the domain-specific terms.
- Question: Co-allocation use case will not be solved by WS Agreement? - It was not meant to be solved here; we split the spec in WS Agreement and WS Agreement Negotiation. The co-allocation scenario requires a negotiation protocol, not just the simple creation we have currently. Jon points it is too bad this WG has lost its focus, which initially was to come up with a protocol for co-allocation. Q: Do we have a roadmap for doing this? - A: Not yet, discussion of roadmap for negotiation was planned for 3rd session, but cancelled due to travel problems. We should discuss this during next f2f (October/November?)
There will be the need for a term language for this, but it seems like a negotiation protocol is needed too.
- NEC will make a proposal for composition until next GGF
- Q: Any constraints on service providers by WS Agreement? - A: Interface has to be provided, but the semantics is up to the service provider itself. Follow up: There should be some guidelines to service providers, since this is an hard issue to solve.
- Q to Bill: Anything about the specification? - A: Out for public comment in around two weeks from now. Encouragement: Comment on it.
- People should also sent the comments made today to the GridForge forum.

More Comments made by Tiziana (EGEE):

- Glossary. In IETF docs is glossary at the beginning of the document. It should be the same for WS Agreement. - Will be done in next version.
- "Offer" term is missing in the glossary and no introduction elsewhere. - We will look into this.
- Confusion concerning "Offer" - "Agreement" throughout the spec. - Will be checked and solved.
- The definition of what the constraints mean is confusing, The spec should be clear at least.

- Q: Compliance of an offer with a template: seems only based on the constraint section, not on the SDTs in the template anymore. - A: True, you have to declare every SDT as an item in the constraints. This is to avoid fake values or schema invalidity when we had SDTs in the templates. There was already a discussion on that, has to be checked again.
Follow up: Implicit compliance can also be envisaged, not advertised to the party negotiating with (hidden constraints).
- Q: can we have a more compact constraint section? Having to declare every SDT is very verbose. - A: Not much else we can do here. Since we say each possible SDT term must be declared (i.e. only what is declared is permitted) we must have items. Maybe we can have a link to a schema listing global elements?
- Q: Examples from the previous spec. read like first check SDT then constraints; this seems to be a good approach. - A: Current spec. limited on constraint compliance. [Further discussion got lost]
- Proposal by Kate: Put annotations into the spec to clarify why changes/... have been made.
- Q: What is ExplorationTime actually? - A: Duration of the guarantee.
- Q: Termination time versus Expiration time: are they different? - A: Yes.
Proposal: make wsag:ExpirationTime an SDT instead. And actually, after discussion we reach the conclusion that it should almost have domain-specific content (an expiration time does not cover every case, for instance an agreement could be valid only by periods of time). Maybe this is a sort of global qualifying condition?
- Kate: All time issues within the spec. should be revisited.
- Terminology issue: "Service Properties" is a misleading word because an SDT itself is a property of the agreement. We should put "Guarantee" in the name since the purpose is to declare variables to be used in guarantees. Proposal: rename "Service Properties" to "Guarantee Variables".
- State machine p. 31: Q: How is the overall state computed? - Kate: it's a good remark. Depending on semantics, it could be more tricky/complex than a logical AND on the state of each term. Also, it raises issues of trust. It is a monitoring issue which should be dealt with in a separate spec, if it can.

Open Issues:

- Is "service runtime state" going to be practical for use? Isn't it simpler for implementation of providers and clients to instead add a domain-specific state to a domain-specific agreement port type?
- We should change the abstract section of the spec to be consistent with the OGSA definition of an agreement that we spent time refining.
- TODO: announcement on list to have people leave comments to GGF during the public comment period of the spec. Important!