

2003-10-23 WSDM UPlat Conference Call Minutes

Agenda

- 1. close on understanding of items
- 2. produce ranked list of items (high, med, low)
- 3. for the "high" items
 - understand goals/process for coming to a recommendation
 - assign champions for each item

Action Items

- Zulah. COB Friday. Post Item list with assigned Priorities. Also ask the entire TC to provide feedback on the priorities.
- Zulah. COB Friday. Post list of item champions.
- Champions. COB Monday. Start discussion via email on recommendation and approach.
- Homayoun. COB Friday. Take over as UPlat subgroup leader.

Motions

- None.

Summary

- Discussed the items and definitions posted to the list. Much had been discussed via email or at the last call.
- Went through all the items on the list and gave them a priority of HIGH, MEDIUM, or LOW. HIGH means that a recommendation will come from this group in time for Version 1. MEDIUM means that a recommendation may come in time for Version 1, but may not. LOW means it is unlikely a recommendation will be in Version 1. There was further discussion of what this means in detail for various items. Some were labeled MEDIUM PLUS, because they are important, but may not have a detailed recommendation, having explanatory information instead.
- Champions were assigned to as many of the items as possible. Champions are expected to draft something and use that to start email discussions on what the recommendations should be.

Meeting Notes

- John volunteered as scribe.
- Roll. Zulah. Andreas D. Brian Carroll. Andreas Maier, IBM. Homayoun. William. Paul Lipton, CA. John.
- No changes to the agenda requested.
- 1. close on understanding of items
 - Igor's input.
 - Identification/Identity. All agreed to it.

- Registration/Discovery/Location. All agreed to it.
- Notification Mechanism. All agreed to it.
- Versioning. Andrea. Skipped it for now.
- Heather. Relationships. Etc. Covered it last week.
- Collections. William sent out an update.
- Addressing. William sent out an update on the 16th.
- Workflow. Talked about, William sent out.
- Policy. Andreas D. Why is it important to MUWS? John thought it was similar to Security – if there is a Policy enforcement mechanism, it must be composable with the manageability interface. John will provide some words on this.
- Negotiations. Zulah had a definition and suggested it would be low on the list. John questioned whether we need to have the ability to negotiate something like a security mechanism. Zulah said that the assumption that the negotiation would occur at higher levels, not dynamically computer-to-computer. And, since it can be done that way, can put it off. There are some good use cases but we should deal with it later.
- Logging. Decided more detail on management requirements is needed.
- Lifecycle. Decided more detail on management requirements is needed.
- 2. produce ranked list of items (high, med, low)
 - All worked on this and came up with these rankings on the call. What the group will do to fulfill these needs. Interpret High as required to be done right away for Version 1. Medium – would like to get into Version 1, but may not be able to. Low – probably won't get into Version 1, can live without it.
 - William – doesn't HIGH mean that there must be a stand-alone capability on the Platform? John – didn't Zulah just say that the criteria is getting it into Version 1, not whether it is a platform capability and universal standard? Zulah – HIGH we guarantee a recommendation in Version 1. It could be to use a standard or do something while waiting for a standard.
 - William – where we need to have external dependencies, such as submitting requirements to other groups, when do we need to identify that? Same time schedule as High, Medium, Low? Zulah – yes, our recommendation would be how to do it now as well as how to move forward with standards groups.
 - Identification – HIGH.
 - Versioning – HIGH. Clarification that it doesn't need to be a standard.
 - Attributes – HIGH.
 - Metadata – HIGH.
 - Addressing – HIGH.
 - Security – +bootstrap security mode? - MEDIUM Plus. May just have discussion of what is needed, not a recommendation. Especially many requirements to keep it in mind when doing the specification, rather than requiring use of WS-Security or SAML.
 - Discussion that it all may be outside the manageability interface specification.
 - Maybe rank as MEDIUM. Capture what we are going to do.
 - Flow – LOW.
 - Negotiation – LOW.
 - Notification Mechanism – HIGH.
 - Registration/discovery – MEDIUM.

- Very basic. But is there a need to require a platform capability? We need to make decisions on what to use.
- Zulah, Medium Plus. Need to address it.
- Collection – MEDIUM.
 - Discussion of Aggregation v. Collection. Are they separate? There was discussion about Collection being an actual proxy earlier.
- Name Resolution – No definition available. Defer for now. Could be part of Addressing or Identification or in between.
- Relationships (Heather) – HIGH.
- Relationship Service (Heather) – LOW.
- Logging – MEDIUM/LOW.
- Policy – MEDIUM Plus. Similar to Security.
- Policy Decision Point/Policy Enforcement Point – LOW.
- Lifecycle Support – Defer until we get more information on it.
- 3. for the "high" items
 - understand goals/process for coming to a recommendation.
 - There was discussion about this throughout the meeting.
 - assign champions for each item. Start discussions on mailing list, draft the
 - Will do this next week.
 - William – Attributes (working on it for WSDL).
 - John – Security.
 - Andreas D. - Policy.
 - Andreas D. - Versioning.
 - Igor – Notification.
 - Homayoun – Metadata.
- Homayoun will take over next week.

END OF MEETING.