April 7, 2004 OGSA-WG teleconference minutes

1 Early discussion

(1) Note taker assignment: Fred Maciel

(2) Roll call
- Fred Maciel (Hitachi)
- Hiro Kishimoto (Fujitsu)
- David Snelling (Fujitsu)
- Latha Srinivasan (HP)
- Jem Treadwell (HP)
- Bill Horn (IBM)
- Jay Unger (IBM)
- Qiu Jie (IBM)
- Sachiko Wada (ASCADE)
- Andreas Savva (Fujitsu)

(3) Approve the minutes of last teleconference:
- Latha asks about the comments on WS-Security
  - Hiro: which one was discussed, the specification approved by OASIS [referred to as "WS-Security" below] or the whole security architecture/stack [referred to as "Web services security" below]? David: WS-Security provides some stuff that we need, but does not address all the needs of the Grid community (distributed authorization, etc.); the discussion was more confusing than it needs to be. Jay: WS-Security is designed to be composed easily with other Web Services standards; agrees with David, potentially very important to us.
  - Hiro: fix statement in last minute from "not stable" to "too low level"? David: the minutes were referring to the whole Web services security (which is still evolving; we need it, but it's not there yet), not to WS-Security. Make this clear in the minutes.
  - Jay proposes "one of these is part of the Web services security roadmap, authorization is not".
  - Hiro: Frank does not want to wait until all Web services security is done.
  - Jay will send a paragraph for the minutes which can be added also to the OGSA spec.
- no further comments, minutes approved with changes

(4) Agenda bashing
- David: add strawman from GFSG on a marketing picture for OGSA
- Discussion on the infrastructure

- – Some clarifications
- – Jem mentions Jim Webber's mail to WS-CAF
- – Ian will try to write the direction of the OGSA-WG "nicely and gently" and have reviewed by members before making it public, then send to the mailing list.
- Hiro: Glossary discussion and provisioning discussion are very similar, combine. Jem: OK.

2 Marketing architecture

- David: GGF made OGSA a flagship architecture. It shows the world that the GGF is not a "mindless gathering of people", that it has a vision and goals. This is important to raise funding. Need some kind of description of what OGSA is about to sell to top-level business managers. Steve Crumb wants a diagram of OGSA and proposed a simple tree, not quite right. David proposes a trunk, plus branches which mean capabilities and WGs also. Not useful for OGSA-WG but will give a good idea of what we are trying to do. Will have "non-GGF" work, such as WSRF. Don't want to delay, needs to be out in 2 to 3 weeks, e.g., want people coming to GGF11.
- David: do you object to this high-level snapshot, unrefined, technically inaccurate, but good marketing tool?
  - – Bill (after some clarifications): good idea.
  - – David: won't worry about overlaps.
- Apparently no strong objections.
- People who want to work on it, send mail to David and Steve Crumb (Cc: Andrew Grimshaw).

3 Core services discussion

- Jay: people in IBM have been looking at the common services (hopes to show a chart in face-to-face). Reached a conclusion that there are essentially two sets of common services:
  - – Lower layer, just barely above WSRF and WS-Agreement: naming, agreement mediation, security (credential translation and encryption), logging (Jay not sure if he agrees), data virtualization (same comment)
  - – Higher layer is "management common services". In many cases map to services in lower layer, e.g. agreement mediation services maps here to "policy and event mediation"; naming maps here to "name correlation".
- Valuable not only to Grids, but to Web services in general.
- A lot of the things that OGSA thought about in the past (metering, etc.) are relegated to much higher levels in the stack.

- David: Grid or Web services people drawing the chart? Jay: both. David: the split in high-level and low-level things comes from a WSDL 1.1 thinking. Sounds like they are thinking in terms of services and so management comes above. Jay: don't know if that is true, but it's an interesting thought.
- Jay: one of the things that are remarkable is that they have taken a lot of things that we thought as one thing and broke in two to three distinct resource materialization services. Jay drilled through one of these (scheduling) to understand the relationship between high and low level things and why it got broken in so many pieces. Almost refuted, but had trouble to defend why they should be brought together. In some cases they were valuable in contexts that we didn't think about, e.g., they used scheduling not only to reserve functionality and execution management, but also to schedule management activities on the resources, such as change management and deployment. After this analysis started getting less uncomfortable with these levels. Similar arguments for agreements and later subscriptions.
  - David: may be on to something, WGs are so focused in what they are using that they put too many eggs in one basket.
- Jay: Working on understanding it and how this maps to OGSA.
- Jay asks what everybody think of a lot more services and with higher granularity
  - David: think of them in terms of interfaces? Jay: not so, thinking of facets of resources; there are different collections of properties that are interesting for different services. With some exceptions (collections) each is separate by resource properties with different services. In OGSI it would be a mess, but in WSRF is fixed. Can have a processor with 10 facets with their own properties and EPRs.
  - Jay (later): "resources" can have multiple facets (e.g., a provisioning facet, i.e., deployable). There are many management disciplines, and each affects resources in a different way. The term "resource" is often confusing because different people think of different facets; need to make the existence of these multiple facets clear. It is obvious to most people that management is multi-faceted, but it's not obvious to people that resources are multi-faceted. Fred: the current definition of resource is that it's a "manageable entity" (compatible with multiple management disciplines); the multiple facets appear explicitly in the term "resource management". Jay: very slight preference to put the multiple facets in "resource", not "resource management". Fred agrees that it's worth clarifying the multiple facets of resources, will think about how to improve the definition.
  - Hiro: we are going to re-organize the taxonomy from taxonomy to profiles which have overlaps. Before call sent provisioning profile and it overlaps with program execution. David: better aligned with what Jay's colleagues are working on.
  - Jay asks people to think about it.

- Further comments on security and composition of services.

4 OGSA glossary and provisioning capability discussions

- Jem wrote definitions and discussed with CDDLM-WG twice. In second discussion there were only minor changes. Doesn't think that Hiro's definitions are out of line with his.
- Some discussion on what is included in provisioning and what supports it (monitoring, deployment of resources (routing tables, software, etc.), orchestration)
- Clarification and discussion on the concepts in Hiro's document.
  - Jay: figure one supported by composition of services in figure 2? Andreas: yes.
  - Jay: in figure 3, is there any inventory manager?
  - Jay mentions also policies.
  - Jay: make it clear in figure 1 that this picture is generic and that is deploying and adjusting resources against an objective. There is always an objective.
  - Andreas: using the PE terminology in the figures and text. Container is a resource.
- Andreas and Hiro will review documents
  - Andreas: text is candidate for part of OGSA document
  - Jem: need to distill Hiro's document into the glossary document, need a crisp definition of all the terms instead of a long explanation
  - Jem: will try to bring in Hiro's concepts (that monitoring and the external adaptation cycle is part of provisioning).