2003-11-04 WSDM UPlat Conference Call Minutes

<u>Agenda</u>

- Roll Call
- Discuss Topics
  - UPlat Document Template (Homayoun)
  - Notifications (Igor)
  - Addressing and Name Resolution (Heather)
  - Transactions (Andrea)

<u>Action Items</u>

- Igor. Soon. Provide updated Notification text based on today's discussion.
- Igor. Soon. Provide words on the scope or goal of UPlat, so the group can come to agreement.
- Andrea. In time to discuss next Tuesday. Update Transactions section.
- Andrea. Soon. Draft a Correlatable Names section – What, Why, How.
- All. Review all the text submitted to be ready to discuss on Thursday.

<u>Motions</u>

- None.

<u>Summary</u>

- The group discussed the document template Homayoun and Andreas put together. Overall everyone agreed it was good. A few areas need to be tweaked. There was a suggestion to put in a Scope or similar section to describe what the UPlat work is for. Mostly, the document needs to be fully populated.
- Igor led the discussion on Notifications. He noted that the HOW section got into the WHY section – the WHY section only has one paragraph. One major point was that Notifications can be treated as a service that the entity receiving the notifications provides, documented in the WSDL. Thus it would have to be a generic service that supports any payload required. There was also discussion of push and pull interaction patterns.
- Delayed discussion of Addressing and Name Resolution until next call.
- Andrea led the discussion on Transactions. She started with how she plans to update the text. Including a UML diagram and more information on the WHY. Igor asked if it was as simple as referencing one standard to use, but Andrea replied that it might be, but she wanted to do more analysis. The group will discuss the updated Transactions next Tuesday.
- The group then discussed Identification. One issue was uniqueness – does it need to be globally unique, unique within one domain, or something else? No recommendations on this yet. Another issue was multiple Identifications for one entity. There will need to be one or more mechanisms to determine if the multiple Identifications refer to the same entity. For example, a manageable resource will have

multiple manageability interfaces, one or more per manageability capability. Andrea volunteered to write a Correlatable Names section to address this issue, since she has been involved with this issue in DMTF and elsewhere. It was also decided to keep Name Resolution and Correlatable Names separate.

Meeting Notes

- Roll Call. Homayoun. William. Andreas. Andrea. John. Igor. Brian Carroll.
- John volunteered as scribe.
- Homayoun noted that Heather sent regrets, so we should skip her sections until Thursday.
- Discuss Topics
  - UPlat Document Template (Homayoun)
    - Andreas added the current state of the definitions and requirements (Whys and Hows).
    - Note that in most cases these need to be augmented.
    - John will suggest some changes to the Introduction, to make it MUWS specific.
  - Notifications (Igor)
    - Igor suggested splitting Notifications text. The latest email he sent was the HOW section.
    - Discussed some formatting problems that split items at the end into two.
    - What is needed are some simple capabilities, and most can be done with existing platforms, with little standardization.
      - To do a notification, both sides have to have matching WSDL. To achieve the three basic items: 1) recipient has to know how to register interest with the source of information 2) source has to know how to deliver information to recipient, and 3) recipient needs to know that is it being notified ans also by which source.
    - Homayoun asked if we need both push and pull models. Igor noted that he was describing a push pattern, as pull would be a request-response, not a notification. Andrea added some examples of both pull and push models. Pull might happen when a resource is off line for a period of time, the user might want to go in and poll to only get recent information and discard older information.
    - Igor said he doesn't disagree with pull, he was focusing on the requirements. And they seem to be the same either way. There may be differences in how you register interest – register for pull or push. And how you receive notifications of events.
    - Homayoun noted that this is like the consumer-provider model, where registering intent may be separate from getting information. Igor was saying we probably want to focus on the two-entity interaction, without introduction of a broker role. John said we should probably clarify that we are not specifying a locus of implementation. Homayoun noted that the interactions should work the same way whether just two entities or many.
    - John asked if the "manager" needs to know about the format of all notifications. Igor said no, but it needs to have a standard "notification" service where it can receive a generic envelope with the standard information, plus the event. Homayoun added that we don't have to model the payload, except maybe some

basic ones, or model some components of the payload. But there should be the capability to send whatever information is appropriate. Igor said he would reflect this in his update.

- Homayoun suggested using roles, and saying we don't care where it is implemented. Igor said he doesn't want to be too formal here, but will clean up the words to use the same name for each role.
- Homayoun – all should review the text after Igor sends his update.
- Addressing and Name Resolution (Heather) – delay until Thursday.
- Transactions (Andrea)
  - Andrea – need more there.
  - Liked Igor's suggestion on the Why, will expand on that and resubmit.
  - Andrea – working on a UML diagram, similar to Brian's for Versioning, to help with the What. Also take the "netconf" references out of the why.
  - Andrea will resubmit so we can talk about it next Tuesday.
  - Igor asked if we need to do anything, or just reference a standard. Andrea is not sure yet, needs more thought.
- Identification.
  - Do they need to be unique within one domain, across all domains, globally?
    - Igor said that we have to decide in our specification how to do this.
    - Homayoun asked if we have to decide the uniqueness scope. Igor said no.
    - Andrea noted that DMTF and others have "correlatable names". Properties of the resource you can look at to determine whether it is the same identity. Because different agents might deliver a different identity to you, yet you want to know that each identity refers to the same manageable resource. This becomes critical in the real world. Igor agreed, but it may not be in this part of the specification. Homayoun noted that this is very important for Management, need to highlight this issue and come up with some high level proposals. Igor would not call it Identity, but call it Correlatable Resources.
    - Andrea volunteered to take "Correlatable Names" since she has done work on it.
    - John noted that there is a section on Name Resolution that is blank, and it seems to be the flip side of Correlatable Names. Andrea suggested we keep them separate. All agreed.
    - Discussion of how it works vs Relationships. Andrea thinks it is different.
    - Decided to capture Correlatable Names somehow, for now will keep it separate. Could describe it as a "same as" relationship. Document techniques and maybe make recommendations on how to do so.
    - Noted that the basic MUWS concept is one plus interfaces for one capability and multiple capabilities. So this is Why This Is Needed? And showing how fundamental it is based on the basic MUWS concepts.
    - Igor, there are other things that can be identified besides manageable resources, like interfaces. Have some of those words in Identity now, but will look at it.
- Andreas noted that this document should have better Scope section. Like this is what is needed in the Platform so that MUWS can happen, as Igor said.
  - Igor noted that the How needs to identify standards that can be used.
  - Homayoun heard a few opinions on this. Asked Igor what needs to be captured in a

few lines, then we can come to agreement on the scope or goal.

END OF MEETING.