

GGF NM WG Notes 12/07/04
Call began at 11:00 am EDT.

Attendees:

Mark Leese
Dan Gunter
Martin Swany
Brian Tierney
Richard Hughes-Jones
Jeff Boote
Matt Zekausaks
Paul Mealor
Susan Evett (scribe)

AGENDA

1. Discuss the draft developers guide (<http://www.cis.udel.edu/~swany/nmwg/devguide-05-dec-04.pdf>) for the new/"normalised" schemas from Dan, Jason and Martin.
2. Discuss when to hold the next face-to-face meeting. The three current suggestions are a half-day fitted in with the next Joint Techs meeting, Salt Lake City (<http://jointtechs.ornl.gov/SLC2005>):
 - Sunday February 13th, PM
 - Wednesday February 16th, PM
 - Thursday February 17th, AM

Eric asked to note that he has not received many comments on number 2 and doesn't feel he has any consensus. Group needs to come to consensus during call!

Item 1: draft developers guide.

Mark asked Dan and Martin to give an overview of the highlights of the document. Meta data, separated from the data section. Then, the request is meta-data only while the response section includes some meta-data and data items. Mark asked if there was a plan to include more general descriptive text (for the benefit of folks who may use this who are not as familiar with the process as members of this group). Dan and Martin agreed that this would be helpful. (1)

The remainder of the document consists of lots of examples on how to use the schema. Martin commented that the example was designed to demonstrate the difference between meta-data and data – Jeff asked, re: results, what gives the program an idea of how many results to expect – is it expected to read until the response stops/runs out or will it receive a notification of how much to expect? Martin commented that that was a good idea – he'll include an example that does. (2)

Brian suggested that the examples has placeholder sections so that they can add an expectation of results in if they wish. (3)

One example addressed how to expand the schema to meet specific testing needs. Paul commented that this is useful – somewhat less ‘practical’ than the others but this simple ‘how to’ example gives users an idea of how to get started. Folks can use the finished examples wholesale but this teaches them how to create their own.

The next section discussed was on the web services wrapper. How you get from having a couple of schemas and knowing what instances you want to exchange and how you actually inform the Web Services wrapper of what to take. Dan noted that he hadn’t had a chance to actually test this – but he feels it is pretty close. Brian felt that this was very useful – a feel for what one needs to do. He admitted to getting a bit lost in the details but feels they are pretty useful. Jeff suggested adding a complete example, with the tools you would use and the data you’d extract, would be useful for most of the users. He commented that his team is more focused on building tools that give data in this schema vs. how to use the schema to draw data out. Brian seconded that – how to get to an actual demonstration environment. Also need to represented the ‘code-first’ approach -- there is already a lot of code out there. Dan noted that, though folks are writing code first, they still need to understand how the schema works a bit before they begin if tools are going to interoperate. He asked what languages folks are using (Perl, Python, etc.) – examples need to be in the language being used. Jeff suggested that, if Dan created an example in Python, he could do one in Perl. Mark said they could do an example in Java. He felt that having several sample implementations (in a variety of languages) it gives folks no opportunity to reject using the work. (4)

Mark had an opportunity to talk with folks from Microsoft re: .Net interoperability – they’ve offered assistance, if needed. He suggested that the group identify specific areas where they could provide help or examples and let them either hold a workshop to bring folks on the WG up to speed or provide examples themselves. (5)

Discussion of structure of import area – suggestion to remove this material, comments on why it is important to include. Includes general information on how things are spelled, how items are arrived at, etc. Jeff wanted to define base types so there would be levels of schema documents (such as where time stamps are included); Mark noted that, if one doesn’t come to the schema until the code is already written, this will be difficult. Discussion about the importance of being able to reference a variety of schemas, broken into bite-size components, that can be interchanged easier. Jeff asked if it would be easy to create a grouping of these components that could be grabbed wholesale. Martin mentioned getting some web location to place all these components. Mark asked if the NMWG will still be the watchdogs for this material? Would folks have to send additions to NMWG for approval? Martin said the current discussions would be both ways – folks could post into some open name space (to describe your measurement and how to represent it) and there would be a GGF NMWG namespace that items would be migrated to, once approval of the group could be obtained. This allows folks to get material OUT

in a timely manner but guards the integrity of the WG's namespace. Vetting needs to happen quickly.

ACTION ITEM: Dan and Martin to add more general descriptive text for the benefit of new users.

ACTION ITEM: Martin to include an example that informs the program how many results to expect.

ACTION ITEM: Martin and Dan to include a placeholder item.

ACTION ITEM: Dan to create an example in Python, from which Jeff will create an example in Perl, and Mark will create one in Java.

ACTION ITEM: Mark to follow up with Jeffery from Microsoft re: concerns with .Net interoperability.

-- Matt Zekauskas Notes from this point until just before Item 2 was addressed --

No one cares about whole thing, easier to pick and choose subsets

If versions change, change on less things

People can't make requests for things that don't make sense

Richard: if sample language representations built on building block method... then it's hard for people to take monolithic one and do it themselves, so inertia will dampen it out

Brian: if components which are schemas, can have code that is also decomposable, and exchange pieces. can jump to library of code rather than WSDL thing.

?1 as a guess, how long going to be before happy to start with implementation.

tied into that - how flexible it is - how easily build a system to do this

something that we should take as a subgroup (dan & martin locked away)

locked up - bad thing.

Martin: last class today, in finals, so working on first cut of perl thing that will throw over the wall as soon as partially baked. spoke to jason, growled about finals... so it'll be a few days. will have perl to represent 2 or 3 of these cases in the framework before christmas.

?2: doc show-and-tell for implementations, or at least description of it

thing that should go into document, is "do it this way unless terrible thing happens"

?1 what do you mean?

Jeff:: not only have impl, but document text too to describe steps?

Matt: right. in the same way that WSDL code, have enough of illusion to WSDL...
good to include perl example, especially for trivial stuff.
then with link to do more

Jeff: once throw over the wall, whether I do it, or warren does it,
shouldn't be too long before we get abilene data too
(being the lazy programmer that I am)

Richard: if things go according to plan, experiences that would be presented
at proposed f2f... feb?

Jeff: don't know how fast my stuff could happen. might take us a month or two,
would be close.

?1: better idea in jan whether we could do that. sounds like we are moving...

Richard: not that there would necessarily be code, but should be things to discuss.
want to know about problems found along way

-- End Matt Zekauskas Notes --

2. GGF NMWG meeting at Joint Techs (SLC, UT)

Polled group – Thursday morning was the most attractive in terms of being able to attend other Sunday Tutorials and the Wednesday afternoon events. Probable attendees include: Brian, Jeff, Eric, Matt, Martin, Dan, and Susan. Mark may be able to attend or setup dial-in access, Brian is unsure about being able to attend.

ACTION ITEM: Mark to get a list of potential attendees to the group – Thursday is the one day folks feel something new won't be added. Preference is for Sunday expressed by several but concerns of overlapping are paramount.

Potential agenda items and expected meeting length were not discussed.

3. GGF Seoul (March)

Mark wanted to know how many people can make it Seoul – to get world buy-in; Paul is a tentative yes (likely) and Brian has funding to attend. He emphasized the interest of Korea and Japan – need to get visibility for the project. Martin will do his best, if there is a quorum, to be in Seoul. Dan doesn't think he'll be able to make it. Other american's didn't indicate they could attend – Jeff will discuss this with Eric to see if anyone in Internet2 can go.

Next call is scheduled for 12/21, same time.

Call ended at 12:15 p.m.