

# WSDM TC F2F Summary

## Monday 12-6

### HP's OGSi refactoring into WSMF summary - Shiva Jayaraman

gives an overview of the refactoring work (document available at:  
<http://www.oasis->

[open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsdm/download.php/3491/WSMF\\_OGSi\\_Refactoring.pdf](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/wsdm/download.php/3491/WSMF_OGSi_Refactoring.pdf))

ManagedObjectIdentity will now extend GridService

All portTypes will now extend ManagedObjectIdentity to enforce implementation of that interface. (HK Q: Interface extension is being used as an enforcement mechanism) and a marker. Perhaps we should separate those purposes and have a separate marker).

WSMF will define normative GWSDL interfaces and the WSDL 1.1 interfaces will be generated using the gwsdl2wsdl specification. (HK Q: And what do your plain WSDL people think of the extraneous information in the new WSDLs? A: Not enough review in HP yet. )

WSMF collection will now extend serviceData.

Plan for WSMF events to extend ogSi notifications.

### WS-Manageability presentation – Igor Sedukhin

Went thru discovery variations

WilliamV: Q: Why no notification mechanism? A: Considered out of scope. Identified plug point and stopped.

WilliamV: Q: How one can add new management interfaces and mark them as management interfaces A: Its known by the namespace right now.

Igor walks through the UML model used by WS-Manageability

### Metamodel Discussion:

Igor explains the use of topics in WS-Manageability:

identification

state

configuration

metrics

relationships

Zulah, William, Bryan walk through the categories in WSMF:

discovery

performance

configuration

control

security

monitoring

identification

We discussed the differences between IBM/CA's topics and HP's categories. One differentiation may be that topics are information oriented and categories are interface oriented. Q: "What is the purpose of these topics/categories? Let's agree on what the intent is before we try to define them." Andrea and Winston made a point that the topics and categories are both just views on some set of information consisting of properties and metadata, operations, events, and relationships. The TC didn't think that it could agree on a set of topics for organizing around at this time, but it could agree that we needed to define properties and metadata, operations, events, and relationships as first principles. Everyone agreed that we will have to come back to this discussion, some were uncomfortable about trying to come to agreement on this now.

A way forward was to concentrate on the 'first principles' and then come back to this. Winston polled the room and this seemed a way forward to the TC.

## **Tuesday Morning - MUWS**

Closed and approved **MUWS requirements** (small wording change, remove appendix b, etc.). This will be posted as a committee Draft.

### **OGSI response to Arjuna paper**

Presentation explained all the options for dealing with State and compared the contextualized vs encapsulated design choices. This was a good summary of the statefulness issues. Shel Finkelstein had many issues with this that he will (and already has been) take offline with Ian Foster, et. Al.

This presentation was part of our education in the TC so that we can figure out how to support Grid requirements and OGS. It is important to figure this out because it impacts how we work with the CMM working group.

### **MUWS Specification Outline**

The current requirements document is not a good outline for the specification. I proposed the following organization which was accepted:

1. Meta Model
2. Architecture – extensive in separate doc; brief in this doc; manager motivation, expose manageability interface about resource
  - Conceptual model – picture
  - Logical model
    - Role & Artifacts definition
      - Responsibilities
      - Capabilities
    - Interaction patterns
    - Manageability Info meta model
    - Distribution arch
3. WS Platform Requirements

Identify platform functionality required (in addition to WS-I basic profile), which specs should be used, the interim solution if there are not existing specs, or pointer to future. Starter unweeded list of potential technologies (source bubbles2.ppt chart):

- Identification – Unique Id for svcs
- Version – version of service, in URIs today, w3c tab? sufficient?
- Attributes
- Metadata
- Addressing – like ws-addressing and gsr/gsh
- Security - +bootstrap security mode?
- Flow
- Policy – may not be reqd for vers 1
- Negotiation
- Notification Mechanism
- Registration/discovery
- Collection
- Name Resolution
- Relation
- Relationship Service?
- Logging
- Policy Decision Point/Policy Enforcement Point
- Lifecycle Support

#### 4. Manageability

Identify functionality/capabilities required to support describing and using manageability of resources using Web services (bubbles2.ppt Manageability bubbles+)

- Properties, operations, events & metadata
  - Identity
  - Version
  - Change control
  - Metrics
  - Configuration
  - State
  - Relationships
- Resource State Model – description of states/transitions
- Basic relationships for manageability (metadata?)
- Event Format and basic Types
- Metric description
- Configuration ?
- Change control

#### 5. Discovery and Introspection

- finding manageable resources
- introspecting manageability interfaces

6. Defining a manageability interface for a manageable resource using this specification

how to mix in functions in section 3 and 4 – probably normative

profiles of manageable resources? ( configurable? monitorable? ) not sure if normative  
how  
Appendix for full schemas, namespaces, types

Also we need a separate primer with to satisfy some of the main usage scenarios.

On the WS Platform section of the specification, we tried to start identifying the WS technologies critical to our work. The TC started and then became reluctant to rule anything out right now, its too early. They want to do some architecture first. The technologies in this section will also change depending on the specification of the Manageability section.

### **MUWS Tasks, Teams, Editors, Timelines**

**Editors:** – John DeCarlo (Mitre), WilliamVampedebe (HP)., Paul Lipton (CA)., Heather Kreger (IBM)

**UArch** – MUWS Metamodel and Architecture Team. This team will define the management using Web services architecture. We have lots of input text for this from the WS-Manageability Concepts submission, WSMF, and our W3C work. Lead: Zulah Eckert (HP), Members: Heather Kreger (IBM), Winston Bumpus(Dell), Igor Sedukhin (CA), Geoff Bullen( Web Methods), Richard Nikula.(BMC), Karl Schopmeyer (OpenGroup), Andrea Westernian (Cisco), Rajiv (Oracle?)

Meeting Time: Thursdays 12-12:45 EST

Nov 1: initial draft of architecture for use by WS Platform team in a second round of platform investigation/recommendations. Also input to the UMan team which will start up then to work on the Manageability section.

**UPlat** – MUWS WS Platform investigation Team. This team will investigate the current laundry list of potentially needed Web services platform technologies. It will make an initial determination about which are absolutely required for the March specification deliverable and of those that are required, where will the specification come from, existing work, and interim specification done by a company, an interim specification done by the WSDM TC, future undetermined work.

Lead: William Vanpedepee, Members: Heather Kreger (IBM), Igor Sedukhin (CA), Hommayun (HP)., Andreas D. (Oracle), Tom Studwell (IBM).

Meeting Time: Thursdays 1:15-2pm EST

Nov 1: initial determination of essential WS Platform technologies with initial recommendations on where to get the technology from. Some of the obvious required (but missing) technologies may be started on a more detailed discussion on who to

acquire or supply interim specifications. Esp: Attributes, metadata, notifications, relationships.

## **Tuesday Afternoon - MOWS**

Closed and approved **MOWS requirements** (Igor will make 3 minor changes: move WSEE to futures, remove reference to CIM from Overall.2, remove appendix b, etc.). This will be posted as a committee Draft.

### **MOWS Specification Outline**

The current outline of the requirements document works for the specification with a few minor changes. The outline is:

1. Overview of manageability model of Web service endpoint, use of MUWS
  2. Identification
  3. Configuration
  4. Relationship
  5. Metrics
  6. Lifecycle / Status
  7. Change Description and Notification
  8. Sessions (may stand alone or merge into previous)
- AppendixA: Representation with schemas, etc.

### **MOWS Tasks, Teams, Editors, Timelines**

**Editors** – Igor Sedukhin, BryanM., BrianC., Fred Carter, Heather Kreger

**OMod** – MOWS UML Model development Team. This team will define the management of Web services UML models. We have lots of input text for this from the WS-Manageability Specification submission, WSMF, some from our W3C MTF work. Lead: Igor Sedukhin Members: BrianC (HP), BryanM (Merant)., Mark Potts (HP), Dan Foody (Actional), Fred Carter (Amberpoint)., Andrea Westernian (Cisco), Geoff Bullen (Web Methods), WilliamVanpedee (HP)., Karl Schopmeyer (OpenGroup)

Meeting Time: Tuesdays 1-2 EST

Nov 1: initial draft of UML models for Web service endpoint.

**Glossary Editors:** Andrea Westernian (Cisco) (lead), Mark Potts (HP), Heather Kreger, Judi Cowell (HP)

### **Team Operations:**

Calls – Reuse existing times

WSDM – 1/2hr – Attendance/reports/issues from teams, Th 12:45-1:15

Mailinglist – Use wsdm list with prefixes

Attendance – WSDM ½ hr, subteams don't count

- MUWS Arch [UArch], Zulah, Th 12:00-12:45E
- MUWS WS Platform [UPlat], William, Th 1:15-2E

- MOWS WS UML Models [OMod], Igor, Tues 1-2E
- MUWS/MOWS Editors - adhoc

### **Timelines and Milestones**

- MUWS Arch
  - Nov 1 – first draft
  - Dec 1 - done
- MUWS Plat
  - Nov 1 – identify req'd, recommend approach
  - Dec 1 – draft req'ds for first submission
- MUWS Manageability
  - Nov 1 - start
  - Dec 1 – scope , State model, event fmt, umls for base manageability model
- MOWs Model
  - Nov 1 first draft
  - Dec 1 models
- Glossary
  - Nov 1 first draft of terms
  - Dec 1 – reasonably stable basic terms
- March Specification content decision, specification phasing
  - Dec 1

### **Next Face To Face**

- Site: Austin, TX
- Host: by Dell (Winston)
- Dates: Dec 2 noon to Dec 4 noon
- Prereqs for next F2F:
  - UArch draft
  - UPlat draft
  - UMility scope, basis mility model, resource state model, event format
  - OMod model
  - MOWS renderings progress
  - Glossary draft

## **Wednesday**

### **CMM and WSDM Collaboration**

CMM Cochair indicated that he wanted to collaborate, it was a matter of how. He will know more next week after the CMM face to face.

1. Membership – most CMM companies are OASIS members and could join WSDM
2. Document process – all documents are public as a tc decision. Can WSDM point to a CMM document? Can CMM specs reference the WSDM documents?
3. Contributions – from CMM members would have to be OASIS members and bound by OASIS IP. CRM could be contributed by IBM to WSDM (as well as

- CMM) if we choose to develop lifecycle or relationships in the WSDM TC using the CMM proposal as a starting draft.
4. Meetings – Meetings can only be attended by those who have joined the wsdm tc for IP reasons.
  5. Mailing Lists – lurkers can lurk thru the archive and access all public documents. Anyone who wants to engage must join the wsdm tc.
  6. IP – WSDM has not declared what the IP for its specification will be yet. So far all submissions are Royalty Free.
  7. Joint publication – one possibility is to have CMM jointly publish the WSDM documents, providing legitimacy of WSDM to GGF. If CMM doesn't get its needs met it can choose to withhold joint publication and do their own work.
  8. Checkpoint in 2 weeks after the CMM meeting.
  9. Current cross membership: Ellen Stokes, Fred Marceil, Mark Potts, Shel Finkelstein, Andrea Westernian, (other HP members), (other Hitachi members).
  10. Ways to collaborate:
    - a. All join WSDM and develop spec. OGSi renderings being done in CMM, WSDL 1.1. in WSDM.
    - b. Divvy up the specs somehow, develop some in WSDM and some in CMM, and point to each other's relevant specifications. (this may be hard for MUWS where strong consistency and alignment is necessary)
    - c. Develop specs in WSDM and co-publish with CMM.
  11. WSDM needs to understand the form of OGSi commitment that would be considered sufficient to begin collaboration.
    - a. Shel is VERY concerned and objects violently to committing that our specification will be supportable on OGSi, he insists there are big mismatches in underlying philosophy that will make our spec terrible if we do this because we'll be forced to do things not well suited to plain Web services.

**Action Items:**

- Post approved MUWS requirements, HK, next week
- Igor send HK approved MOWS requirements next week
- Post approved MOWS requirements, HK, next week
- UArch Draft – Zulah/team, Nov 1
- UPlat first set of recommendations, William/team, Nov 1
- OMod models – Igor/team, Nov 1
- Form UMan team Nov 1, HK/Winston
- WDSM/DMTF work register, Winston, next week
- Work through CMM collaboration technicalities – Fred, Ellen, Heather, Winston, Jamie
- Glossary terminology draft, Andrea/team, Nov 1
- HK/Winston update calendars to reflect
- Is call timing an issue for CMM collaboration? And for which calls? 2 weeks. If we begin collaboration on MUWS Manageability section or interim solutions we may be able to schedule that subteams calls when it is formed conveniently for Fred in Japan.

### **Discussions with Jamie Clark on how to collaborate**

Jamie provided the answers to the questions above. He encouraged us to try to work under the OASIS WSDM TC rather than coordinate officially joint meetings as it is difficult to do. Some notes from our discussion:

- Membership – join oasis, \$250 individual membership,
- Document process – docs in public archives, IBM &/or GGF could donate CRM to WSDM so that WSDM could use as input document. Finished work done by WSDM and pointed to by CMM? Or... done by CMM and pointed to by WSDM? Co-publish?(then need to negotiate versioning, ownership, etc.).
- Meetings (conf calls, f2fs) – joint mtgs? Difficult w/o joint membership because of membership. Can co-locate but meet as one or other. Unofficial work needs to be reintroduced into TC.
- Contributions – from GGF, ip, permissions need to be shared, give permission to oasis on contribution
- Mailing lists
- IP -

OASIS is Transparent, archivable, supermajority votes

Difficult to restrict TC to an answer, can insert into the process and trust tc/process to come out with the right answer

What does CMM want from WSDM in order to come over?

Alternative, stay where it is, introduce major overlap. Less successful than joining into a unified effort

Does CMM want to subject itself to WSDM TC

If CMM doesn't get something, can it retreat to its own spec to accomplish its own goals