

OGSA Teleconference - 20 March 2006

Attendees:

- Hiro Kishimoto
- Mark Morgan
- Susanne Balle
- Chris Smith
- Steven Newhouse
- Fred Maciel
- Marvin Theimer
- Jem Treadwell
- Dave Berry
- Andrew Grimshaw
- Glenn Wasson
- Jay Unger
- Heather Kreger

Minutes: Jem Treadwell

Summary of Actions:

- Mark to make minor corrections to March 23 minutes.
- Marvin to prepare charter materials for an HPC Profile BoF at GGF17.
- Hiro to discuss f2f location with Ravi; consider hosting solely at single location.
- Hiro to send Glossary 1.5 URL to Marvin.
- Hiro to create GridForge folder for HPC documents.
- Heather to provide details of the IBM/Microsoft Security roadmap document.
- Session leaders to give Hiro details for the f2f agenda.

Previous Minutes

The March 23 minutes were approved with the following correction: One attendee's name and DRMAA were misspelled. Mark will fix this.

Webcast

Dry Run: April 19th

Date: April 26th

HPC Profile Discussion (Marvin):

Hiro: Status of use case document?

Need to plan for GGF17 – write up a proposed charter & the standard seven questions and answers.

Will have e-mail discussions, and then do a BOF at GGF17 – not clear whether this will be a separate working group.

Marvin: To clarify from Athens discussion, the constraints from Microsoft are that we need to lock down what we're going to build by the end of August, to maintain a schedule to be able to ship products within two years. Is it feasible to come up with something that people could build to by the end of August? If not Microsoft would have to defer. Andrew: Once we understand the use case and can use things that are going ahead in GGF then August is tractable. If we have to develop new stuff then it's not so likely. Hiro: Based on the document process in GGF the formal publication cannot be done by August, but many organizations base work on early versions – that way we get experience. Agree that August may be reasonable if we don't depend on final publication. Marvin: Agree, because we learn something from interops.

Marvin: Status of use cases: Want something that is even simpler than the base grid case – first use case may not be grid, but it does represent a simple HPC case. Need to come up with a fairly simple extension model. Would like to get common cases identified and have discussion about extension mechanisms by GGF17. Hiro: To be done by August use cases must be completed by GGF17. Marvin: would like to have a first real strawman by April f2f; will try to get the common cases out by e-mail, and define the simple case. Trick will be to slice/dice them in ways we can map to extensions. Try to identify common use cases in the next 2-3 weeks, if people participate.

Things to be done: EMS, JSDL, BES, maybe CDDLM (not the base case).

Andrew: I'm writing a paper that takes the use cases and identifies the relevant standards.

Andrew: Take the use case from Slide 6 [see Marvin's slides from Athens: <http://tinyurl.com/qe3eb>]. In addition to simple sequential tasks, does your simple use case also include parallel jobs such as MPI? Yes. Are you also including MPI jobs that cross site boundaries? Marvin: No – not a very common case. I'd be thinking of the type of jobs that would be run on a Beowulf cluster. Job scheduling and data transfer are the things that are currently missing. Andrew: Are you looking for advance reservation, or just allocation? Marvin: Allocation is probably sufficient for the simplest case. It's useful to split reservation out from execution. Andrew: Agree - advance reservation is something that not everyone has. In job scheduling, there's at least three things – reservation or allocation, provisioning, execution – need to split those out. Don't treat these things as the base case: these are things we need to think about.

Hiro: Can you use the same meanings of the words as are in the OGSA glossary? Sure. Hiro to send URL to Marvin.

Susanne: Where are the use cases? Marvin: OGSA mailing list. Hiro will create a new folder on GridForge to store documents.

Convergence Discussion (Heather):

In this Q&A session Heather responded to questions about the recent WSRF/WS-Man convergence announcement from HP, IBM, Intel & Microsoft:

<http://www-128.ibm.com/developerworks/webservices/library/specification/ws-roadmap/>

- Dave Berry: Purpose of TransferAddendum? Defines a signature that allows a body to be passed in, and ResourceTransfer defines a specific body. Dave: Why not do it all in ResourceTransfer – why do we need Addendum? So other standard bodies can be defined – we don't know of any right now.
- DB: Any equivalent of BaseFaults? Not that I've seen. Why? Some of the eventing work is in progress; not clear that we need a separate spec.
- DB: ServiceGroups? Haven't got far enough to know how that falls out.
- DB: What are the plans for involving other organizations? Will follow WS-Workshop process where we invite others to offer feedback, hold interoperability sessions, then submit to an SDO. Encourage people to come to feedback sessions, but also welcome to get involved after submission. Hiro: Worry about the delay. Will take a longer time than if you start with the standards bodies. E.g. workshop process may take one or two years, then SDO another one or two years. Heather: Hope we can get to submission by the end of this year – best compromise we can find.
- [Heather gets disconnected for a while – returns to call during this exchange.] Q: What do the WSRF folks think of this? Jem: Discussed at today's WSRF TC meeting, and Ian Foster has posted a positive article in GridToday from Globus perspective. No major issues with it at the WSRF TC meeting – Ian Robinson told the TC that IBM plans to continue to build and enhance WSRF-based products, and does not plan to abandon it. Steven: WSRF seems to be end-of-life – people will build on the new stack. Heather: Right now people should build on existing stacks, and be confident that their work will be preserved in the new. Andrew – interfaces won't change.
- Hiro: My biggest concern is the WS-Workshop process, because it's not open. Steven: But will go through the standards body. Heather: IBM doesn't expect it to be unchanged in standards phase.
- Marvin: Biggest benefit is interops: CORBA's problem was that versions are not interoperable. Hiro: Problem with interops is that you have to sign an NDA – really not open. Andrew: IP needs to be relaxed; what are they trying to protect against? Heather: can bring that feedback to the companies – good intentions. Andrew: Generally intended to limit bad press on quality; Heather: more an issue of who owns the feedback, so that it can be incorporated and still release the spec. Fred: The NDA requirement can still influence participation.
- Hiro: Roadmap shows new specs depend on current transfer and eventing. Still proprietary specs. If this doesn't change OGSA will have a problem. Fred: In OGSA profiles specs have to be at a certain level of adoption... Heather: IBM's view would be that it would be premature to use those specs – better to get a full set, then work at standardizing the group.
- Hiro: Stack is based on 2004 versions of WS-Man specs. What are the plans? Heather: Not sure of how the process will work out.

- Fred: In WSDM some protocols weren't standard and the whole stack becomes invalid. We have to be concerned. Heather: Once all specs are out we can work this out, but I don't know when or how it will be worked out. I understand the issue and will feed it back.
- Hiro: Document talks about continuation of the previous roadmap effort, but no explanation of what that was. Heather: I think that refers to the security roadmap we did with Microsoft. Hiro: But the perception is that the WS-Security process slowed down the standards process – people were not happy with that. When did the Security roadmap come out? Heather: Will let you know.
- Hiro: Paper says WS-Man & WSDM have almost the same functionality – is this true? Heather: Overlapping functionality that has been factored differently across the two stacks. Committed to a common management stack. Don't know how this will be provided, but we do plan to do it.

F2F Plans:

- Location: Tuesday/Friday, Fujitsu, Wed/Thu Intel. Steven & Mark expressed a preference not to split; Hiro will talk to Ravi and consider using a single location.
- Schedule: Jem isn't yet sure if he will make the f2f, and if so he may travel on Tuesday. Hiro will move the Roadmap discussion to Friday. Session leaders give Hiro their input for the agenda.

GGF17 Sessions:

- Steven: If we make progress on EMS at the f2f it would be good to start exposing the use cases. A plenary-style session would be preferable to workshop, if we can't decide this at the f2f. Steven to consider and discuss on Wednesday or next week.
- Fred: We could have an info model session, but prefer to wait until the f2f to decide. May not be a priority.