

OGSA-DAI Platform Dependencies

Malcolm Atkinson
for OMII SC
18th January 2005



OGSA-DAI: Current Release Status

- **Production Release R5**
 - On OGSI GT3 Implementation
 - ▶ Full set of currently available functions
- **OMII Technical Preview available**
 - On WS-I+ OMII platform
 - Configured for OMII 1 platform
 - Work planned to integrate fully with OMII platform
 - All of R5
 - ▶ All Relational DB operations: Query, Update, Bulk load
 - ▶ All XML DB operations: Query, Update & Bulk load
 - ▶ All File operations: Index, Query, read & write
 - ▶ All data translation operations
 - Except functions which require state retention
 - ▶ These are asynchronous and incremental data transfers
- **WSRF Technical Preview**
 - Alpha release on GT4 alpha
 - ▶ To give feedback into GT4 & for user preview
 - ▶ Functions as for R5 except those requiring naming / identification of state

Requirements for State

- **Third-party data delivery**
 - To avoid extra handling via client
 - When data is collected at a time chosen by a consumer
- **Asynchronous data delivery**
 - Essential with large result sets or streams
 - ▶ E.g. deliverTo/From GridFTP
 - ▶ And consumer-pull protocols deliverTo/From Stream
 - Stream from source to consumer
- **Those with small data sets**
 - Well supported by the functions on WS-I+ platform
 - ▶ E.g. deliverTo/From URL, deliverTo SMTP

Customer Options

- **Those with small data sets**
 - Well supported by the functions on WS-I+ platform
 - ▶ E.g. deliverTo URL
- **Those with expectations of larger Data Sets**
 - Use OMII platform to develop applications
 - **Provided we commit to stateful operations in OMII release schedule by a suitable date**
- **Those with large data applications Now**
 - Continue on GT3 platform
 - Transfer to WS-I+ **extended** platform later

Surveying existing and new user communities to assess distribution of requirements. Approx. equal each option. Expect this to evolve rapidly over next 6 months

Challenge for Us

- **Upper Middleware Developers**
 - Require portability of code
 - i.e. same code functions on all infrastructures
- **Requires**
 - Models that work on all infrastructures
 - Consistent semantics from all infrastructures
 - Preferably consistent protocols and APIs
- **Must deliver**
 - Consistent semantics to our customers (application developers)
 - ▶ Then captured in standards
 - Consistent APIs (Enshrined in Standards & CTKs)

Technical Strategy: Requirements

- **Mechanism for creating and managing state**
 - c.f. WS-Resource - only selected portions!
 - **WS-Resource Life Time**
 - ▶ 4th version of standard proposal draft at OASIS
 - ▶ Proposal imminent
 - ▶ Multiple implementations
- **Mechanisms for Addressing state**
 - **WS-Addressing**
 - ▶ Proposed standard at W3C
 - ▶ Well supported & wide set of implementations
 - ▶ Expected in OMII Releases summer 2005
- **Mechanisms for naming / identifying state**
 - Developing in OGSA-DAI, DAIS & OGSA data

Technical Strategy: Proposals

- **Mechanism for creating and managing state**
 - Adopt what we need of WS-Resource Life Time
 - Import implementations (WSRF:Lite and GT4 Apache)
 - ▶ Choose minimal subset we can safely use now
- **Mechanisms for Addressing state**
 - Adopt WS-Addressing
 - ▶ Commit firmly to OMII Releases June 2005
 - ▶ Choose our use pattern
- **Mechanisms for naming / identifying state**
 - Continue our pioneering
 - Establish UK standard in conjunction with Grimoires
 - Push to standards: DAIS, GFS, OGSA-naming @ GGF
- **Mechanisms for Notification**
 - Use WS-BasicNotification
- **Develop data transport abstractions**
 - Clients / Application Developers should not be directing detail
 - Upper M/W needs flexibility from higher-level requests
 - ▶ Pioneer and develop standards at GGF

**By June
05?**

**By June
05?**

**By Sept
05?**

**By Sept
05?**

**By March
06?**

**Security is a cross-cutting issue with multiple technologies.
How do we support and interact with security mechanisms?**

Conclusions

- There are differences between OGSA-DAI on the 3 Infrastructures
- This is undesirable
 - Consequence of different infrastructure semantics
 - Not very serious for most users
 - Should be addressed by Summer 2005
- Infrastructure variation has a high cost for Upper M/W developers
 - And application developers
- Urgently need more comprehensive and fewer standards
 - Integration of standards in profiles is a coping mechanism
- Urgently need infrastructure providers working to develop a single common infrastructure