February 23, 2004 OGSA-WG teleconference minutes

1 Early discussion

(1) **Note taker assignment: Fred**

(2) **Roll call (including e-mail)**
   - **Hiro Kishimoto (Fujitsu)**
   - **Fred Maciel (Hitachi)**
   - **Jem Treadwell (HP)**
   - **Latha Srinivasan (HP)**
   - **Ravi Subramaniam (Intel)**
   - **Sachiko Wada (Ascade)**
   - **Andreas Savva (Fujitsu)**
   - **Michael Fraenkel (IBM)**
   - **Hariharan Balakrishnan (IBM)**
   - **Jeffrin J. Von Reich (HP)**

(3) **Approve last week's teleconference minutes (2) and F2F minutes**
   - **Ravi had comments about the program execution discussion (why was execution planning changed to scheduling and why drop queues), what led to the discussion and to the conclusions. He sent an email to the list. Since this is not a problem with the minutes but with the conclusion Andreas suggested raising this issue again during a call.**
   - **Hiro gave an update on some of his action items**
     - **Hiro had an action to find out the appropriate document type for the Use Case document. After consulting with Dave Snelling and Charlie Catlett it was decided that the document should be Informational. (It is not widely accepted practice, so it's not Community Practice yet.)**
   - **No further comments, all minutes approved.**

2 Job Contents Service contents

- **Basically document presented at the face-to-face, reflecting the comments made there. Andreas explained changes; mainly change the terms used and add some explanation. Some questions for clarification from Ravi.**
- **Questions by Ravi on the verification service.**
  - **For example, verifies whether the resources allocated match what the application contents define as appropriate.**

- – Ravi: Cannot write a generic tool that does verification for all possible application.. Andreas/Hiro: Agreed, require application specific information (and this is the information kept in the application contents).
  - – Ravi: Not just information but also 'scripts." Note that "script" does not mean (just) a "shell script", it means a process to do verification (even a workflow), defined by the vendor of the application.
- Procedures for Job Lifecycle Management:
  - – Ravi, Michael: Using the term "Job" here gives the image that the Application Contents service will be called each time there is a Job lifecycle event.
  - – Andreas: That is not the intention. The procedures are stored as application contents. When the job is instantiated they become part of the Job (or hosting environment of the Job).
  - – Action: Andreas to revise the terminology and also add explanation on definition of "procedures."
- Michael: procedure for standard installation of application? Hiro: this is being defined by the CDDLM-WG.
  - – Ravi: need another meta-level service (e.g., workflow). Hiro: yes, there is a hierarchical procedure.
- Discussion on the OGSA glossary definition of application, program, job, etc. Ravi: definitions are not precise yet, need to re-visit definition.
- Self-management policies: This is the wrong term; these are application management policies.
  - – Ravi: description lies with application.
- Lifecycle figure (page 5)
  - – Ravi: this is a job lifecycle, not an application lifecycle.
  - – Andreas: Right, the states are job states. Delete and do a new lifecycle example.
- Verified Resource Description example:
  - – Andreas: Might also include sample job description as terms. Also the verification scripts mentioned earlier.
  - – Ravi: Agreement does not look correct here. Talk about terms and constraints, not agreements.
  - – Andreas: Agreed, the term "agreement" should be deleted.
- Other corrections/additions
  - – Change "related data" or "data" to "configuration data"
  - – Application contents might also include definitions of liveness checks, or correctness checks in addition to verification checks.
  - – In "Example of Application Structure" might be better to show the ordering of the nodes as dependencies.

- **Andreas to update the document.**
  - Hiro: Probably no time to review it on teleconferences, will review it on the mailing list.

3 OGSA document re-organization discussion

- **Ravi sent out a set of slides with his proposal on how to explain OGSA. Discussion based on it followed.**
- **Ravi: instead of a single foil, the figures show how the thing is deployed. There are many services which come together to provide security, provisioning, data, etc. What it tries to show it that you can group them together depending on what you want to do. Every service has a common portion (in yellow) called the "fabric", and then a specific portion.**
- **Third slide shows relationships; such relationships can be defined to provide capabilities. So services come together and are composed to provide a functionality; there is no single service that one can point at that provides "security".**
- **A data service can use security services to provide access control, then something could use a data service. It's a compositional paradigm.**
- **Hiro wonders if it's an extension of existing taxonomy and hierarchy? Ravi: this figure captures aspects (e.g., composition) that are not in the existing figures. It shows categories of capabilities, not categories of services.**
- **Hiro: difference between capabilities and services? Ravi: to do authorization you need policy, etc. If I want to get a security capability, I need several services in the environment. It's not a traditional stack. It does not mean that program execution requires core services.**
- **Hiro: what is the "fabric" on the slide? Ravi: the standard interfaces that all services need to implement to participate on the Grid. Fabric is a very thin layer.**
- **Ravi: plumbing are things that need to be in the environment, but we don't necessarily have control over them (networks, etc.).Hiro: do we need to mention the plumbing? Not necessarily, but it may explain certain things (it runs on this host, in this network, etc.). We state that we expect these things to be there. If it is a distraction, it can be taken out. The services virtualize the hardware pieces, but the actual things (the actual CPU, etc.) need to be there somewhere.**
- **Ravi: open for suggestions on how much should be put on the fabric, on the plumbing, etc.**
- **Hiro: is execution planning part of orchestration? Ravi: lists on the slide is not full list, just an initial proposal with a few examples.**
- **Hiro: how to proceed? Ravi: separate in 3 or 4 foils to make simpler.**

- – Jem: heavy use of color might be a problem in the OGSA spec. Ravi: agreed
- Jem and Fred say that the proposal is interesting.
- Hiro: continue to discuss before GGF10? Fred: no time to discuss and polish enough in time to put in OGSA spec. Hiro: agreed, perhaps use these figures only for presentations.

4　Action items

(1) New
- Andreas to create new version of the document, to be discussed further on the mailing list or a subsequent call if time can be allocated.
- Ravi to create new version of presentation.