

2003-11-18 WSDM UPlat Conference Call Minutes

Agenda

- Continuing with more definitions (what and why) of the platform features that remain.
 - transaction
 - collection
 - correlatable name
 - security (Did we get a closure on this?)
 - registration and discovery
 - lifecycle
 - name resolution
 - flow
 - negotiation
 - relationship service?
 - logging

Action Items

- John. Provide updated What, Why, and How text for Security.
- Andrea. Beef up the example for Transaction.
- Andrea. Reword Collection to capture discussion, such as they can be ordered or unordered.
- Andrea. Update Correlatable Names section and also add explanation of why it is a subset of Identification.
- Homayoun. Update Registration and Discovery.
- Heather. Update Lifecycle. Split into two sections.

Motions

- None.

Summary

- Discussed Transaction. Andrea had sent out a contribution to the list. Based on the discussion, Andrea will update the text, including a beefed up example.
- Discussed Collection. Discussed ordered vs. unordered collections – both are possible, need to clarify. Discussed grouping of actions on manageable resources – a collection may or may not support this. Also noted that the text needs to mention that a collection is itself a manageable resource.
- Discussed Correlatable Names. Discussed various work that has gone on in this area. Decided that it was a subset of Identification. So the section will become a subsection under Identification, rather than being merged.
- Quickly covered Security – John still on the hook for updating and adding the How.
- Quickly covered Registration and Discovery. Homayoun will update the text and send it out.
- Discussed Lifecycle. Heather pointed out that during the WS-SOS discussion, the

group had split this into two – one for operational states and one for creation and destruction of manageable resource instances. Heather will split this in two and update the text.

- Finally, with only two more calls left for the subgroup before the F2F, will try and solve the What and How via email, and discuss the How during the calls.

Meeting Notes

- John volunteered as scribe.
- Continuing with more definitions (what and why) of the platform features that remain.
 - Transaction.
 - Andrea sent out text and a UML diagram to the list.
 - Andrea will put in some more words and beef up the example. And talk about the three possibilities for a response, roll-back, do nothing, compensate as best you can.
 - Andrea. Web Services themselves have need of Transactions, whether or not they are Management Web Services.
 - Homayoun. Hadn't we discussed this as a future feature? Andrea – thought it was Medium, but above the line.
 - Collection.
 - Andrea had no problem with what was written there. Should we clarify whether it should be an ordered grouping? A collection could be a list of spares in some order. DMTF have two different aggregations, one is an ordered aggregation, the other is not, both go into collections. Heather discussed whether an ordered collection could be one example of a collection.
 - Homayoun – is this just a tag on the collection, meta data? Andrea. Maybe the collection isn't different, just the associations.
 - Put in a sentence “It could be ordered or unordered.”
 - John – isn't it just the Next function? Andrea – you could query it with the give me the highest ordered number, as another example.
 - Homayoun – add a sentence - “There is no requirement to have an ordering, but creating an ordered collection list is possible.”
 - John – a collection is itself a manageable resource.
 - Heather – mentioning the “group invocation” is part of the Why.
 - Andrea mentioned that some collections may not have a group invocation.
 - Andrea will take an Action to reword this – capture that it is manageable, can be ordered or unordered. Why examples are group invocation and spares.
 - Correlatable names.
 - Discussion of the “class definition”. Andrea says it is data from the information model for the manageable resource, that arrives via the manageability interface. Andreas suggested “meta data attached to one or more attributes in the information model for the manageable resource.”
 - Discussion of how it is implemented in Cisco. They have tags as meta data. Examples with fiber channel (check one attribute – worldwide name), network resource (two attributes need to match), etc.
 - Want to get away from the “manager knows it is fiber channel so asks for worldwide name”. Have some way of asking for the set of correlatable name

- data for the manageable resource. Potentially null, as well.
- Homayoun noted that Meta Data is not currently specified clearly. Yet this type of meta data may be more constrained and prescriptive. Should we make this a Use Case for the Meta Data? Heather – add it to the requirements for Identification, since it is needed due to lack of globally unique identifiers. And Identification is needed for identifying which manageable resource is involved.
 - Decided to make this a subsection of Identification.
 - Andrea took an Action to clarify based on discussion and will write why it is a subset of Identification.
 - Security (Did we get a closure on this?).
 - John – no. Need to send out the text of what we agreed to.
 - registration and discovery.
 - Homayoun will update the text. It is pretty good, but could be clearer.
 - Lifecycle.
 - Heather thinks it is intended to be the state of the manageable resource. Also, we changed it to Resource State Model, to avoid confusion about creating, such as using a factory. Intended to keep the creation and deletion of manageable resources (instances) separate. The other topic would be Service Lifecycle.
 - Homayoun will change title to Resource State Model (Resource Lifecycle). And create a new section called Service Lifecycle?
 - Can we have better examples? Heather took the Action to fix up the wording, especially the example, which is part of the Why.
 - Andrea – DMTF has talked about State being determined by looking at current attributes of instances. And State of Computer System is more than just State of CPU – complex resources that are compositions of other things. Heather noted it should be netted out in the information model. Andrea – up and down should be netted out, but sometimes it is Policy that determines your actual state.
 - Do we need a State Transition Diagram known? Some information at least on how it transitions from one state to another. At least the general lifecycle the resource goes through.
 - Andrea noted that how you define “upness” may vary. Some resources are more critical, may need more fine-grained. Homayoun noted that it depends on the specialized domain you are in.
 - Does the manageability need to know what state the resource is in? Andrea – yes, but there are influences on that, such as certain policies.
 - Decided to continue the What and Why via email and use phone time to discuss the Hows. Only two more calls left.
 - Can do this for Policy and others immediately, as there is already consensus. Need to work on the others quickly.

END OF MEETING.