

March 18, 2004 OGSA-WG teleconference minutes

1 Early discussion

(1) Note taker assignment: Fred

(2) Roll call

- Fred Maciel (Hitachi)
- Hiro Kishimoto (Fujitsu)
- David Snelling (Fujitsu)
- David Martin (IBM)
- Latha Srinivasan (HP)
- Jem Treadwell (HP)
- Frank Siebenlist (ANL)
- Andrew Grimshaw (UvA)
- David Berry (NeSC)
- Takuya Mori (NEC)
- Abdeslem Djaoui (RL)
- Jay Unger (IBM)
- Hariharan Balakrishnan (IBM)
- Jeffrin J. Von Reich (HP)
- Susan Malaika (IBM)
- Ravi Subramaniam (Intel)

(3) Approve March 4 minutes: no comments, approved.

2 Next face-to-face

- Jay had the idea of a face-to-face just to discuss the PE contents.
 - Jay asks for status and relationship to other GGF WGs. Sat through discussion in GGF10, wants to have something to read and review.
 - Andrew: PE work is close to completion. Andrew will possibly contact Jay separately and explain contents and/or write text and send to Jay.
 - ♦ Jay: maybe face-to-face is not needed depending on status.
- Main time constraints below
 - Mid-may better for Andrew. Giving final exams on Saturday May 1st
 - Jem mentions WSDM face-to-face (April 14 and 15)
 - Jay: avoid OASIS TC week (last full week of April)
 - CCGrid week of the 19th of April
 - Golden week in Japan (29th of April to 5th of May for Fred, similar dates for others)

- May 11th and 12th a good candidate (becomes tentative date)
- Place:
 - Jay suggests Washington as place for PE face-to-face.
 - UK mentioned. Andrew: close to major airport is better (comments that sites proposed are close)
 - Jay mentions California as better for people in Japan
 - David Martin suggests Chicago
 - Best candidates considered to be UK (London) and California (Bay Area).
- Continue discussion on the mailing list.

3 Security design team discussion

- Work of the design team is essentially to extend work on VO use case and highlight components there. Take more security-related use cases to pull out requirements. An extension of work being done now. Wants to pull more people to that effort.
- Jay: lot of focus on authorization and trust brokerage. Frank: idea is to broaden it to other components (protocols, attributes, etc.).
- Jay: there is still a security WG and area in GGF. Why shouldn't this design team be part of this area?
 - David: talked to Dane Skow (security AD) if related WGs (OGSA Security and AuthZ) would help form design team, but they wanted to operate separately. Frank: understood differently, WGs want to revise work in OGSA, but not related to this work in OGSA.
 - Jay: Charlie Catlett said in GGF10 keynote that OGSA is GGF's flagship architecture and wants WGs to synergize with OGSA. This brings resources to OGSA. Afraid that this design team misses the opportunity for that and also to engage them. Frank: disagree, learned from use cases that it was better not to do work in isolation of security experts but with other participants; also, presented contents in Authorization WG and was very successful, they will add it to charter.
 - Jay: it's better to charter a WG in the security area to share the load. Frank: let's give the design team a try, may decide later to move it somewhere else.
 - David Berry: insert in OGSA doc. Jay: not only an insert, it's a new spec.
 - Jay: Need people from related WGs participating in decisions from get-go. Fear that they might not accept our output. Frank: wants to call other people, so that we don't work in isolation.
 - Jay: willing to see what the uptake of the related parts of GGF. But put a mark on the wall to come back to subject.

4 Data services design team discussion

- Started from discussions in GGF10. Quite keen to be involved and to expand what is in the OGSA spec. Start from data area gap analysis, continue through services. Push coming from the people in data area.
- Jay: should be viewed as an activity of the data area. David: most important is to get the right people involved. Design teams can cross WGs.
- David: it will be a short-lived activity. Jay: it won't, but it will end up encompassing work in DAIS, file, replication, caching, etc.
- David: question is how is structured. If needs to be longer than "short-lived", re-think.
- Susan: will be revising gap analysis in next weeks with input from GGF10.
- Jeffrin, summarizing: (1) create focus team (2) involve people from data area (3) re-think if it takes longer.
- Concerns on people's bandwidth. David: design team is responsible for getting input, but not working on it. Hiro: wonders how many data area WGs will commit.
- Jay explains that concern is buy-in (example with data services). Willing to wait and see, but not for long, concerned if the OGSA taxonomy will be done by the people involved in WGs.
- Susan: possible to give overview of OGSA? New people come in all the time. Jay: can do.
- David Martin: design team will permeate, will force people to think more about these issues. Jeffrin: agree, need to start by synchronizing.
- Hiro: next step? Dave Berry: invite chairs of data area WGs. Susan: collaboration of DAIS and CGS, could contact groups outside data area as well (WGs are identified in gap analysis). Also, make sure that chairs communicate that to WGs. David Martin: data area mailing list also.

5 Use case document

- Hiro: submitted use case document to GGF editor. Now we have a tier-2 document. Send this tier-2 document to GGF or put in OGSA site? David Snelling: tier-2 document will be changing, so it should not be sent to the GGF editor for now.
 - Jeffrin: both documents are dynamic and will keep changing (tier-2 more dynamic). Whether to send or not depends on where people go to search document.
 - ♦ David Snelling: can't change document once submitted, new review is more than a version document.
 - ♦ Fred: Jeffrin confusing documents submitted for review GGF and documents submitted to the editor (explains the difference).

- Jeffrin agrees that tier-2 should not be sent to editor.

6 OGSA spec update

- Hiro sent list of categories and services and asked people to review assignments. Plan is to re-write most of the text before GGF11.
 - Fred: what is the current plan for 1.0? Hiro: keep schedule targeted at GGF11.
- Jay: contact Heather Kreger and Jeff Frye to show taxonomy work. Fred shows interest, Hiro supports. Jay to contact Fred and Hiro soon.
- Discussion on whether, and how, Service Groups are in WSRF.

7 Discussion of teleconference time

- Ian can't make it on Thursdays. Other possible slots are Monday (used already), Tuesday and Wednesday. Some discussion, with no good candidates.
- Hiro to send proposals of time slots to mailing list and gather people's availabilities.