Comment	Originator	Comments	Outcome	Status
~~1~~	Zach Hill	The inclusion of authorization information in the DEPR seems problematic as it requires additional security measures to protect the DEPR itself. EPRs generally name and describe how to access a resource, but do not provide the actual request parameters themselves. A better approach might be to separate the DEPR from the credentials required to access it by providing a delegation interface to the DTF itself.	We think that putting in a security mechanisms in the DTF or DTI port types would not be a good move now as currently there are no agreed mechanism for doing this. When these security mechanisms are standardised we will look to integrating this into a future version of the spec.	Resolved
~~2~~	Duane Merrill	It's unclear how HTTP/SCP/etc would work. I could envision the destination DEPR having a file://blah protocol so that, if the DMI instance was co-located with the sink, you could use http as the source.	Added an example using the file scheme and added a paragraph clarifying issues with third party transfers.	Resolved
~~3~~	Chris Sosa	I have a comment about the different states you mention in 5.4.1. I notice that the the transferrer may be in the process of "undoing" a transfer upon a failure. What state is returned during this process? I imagine an "undo" state would be different from both a transferring and failed states.	Additional text has been added to the failed state in sections 5.4.1.5->8. We now also have a Failed state - when in this state it undertakes the undo strategies before it ends up in one of the failed clean/unclean/unknown states.	Resolved
~~4.1~~	Rob Schuler and Anne Chevernak	From section 3: “the ability to transfer data from one location to another” I had a bit of a misconception about the goal of the OGSA-DMI specification before I reviewed it. I previously thought it would be similar to the Globus Reliable File Transfer service or the Storage Resource Management srmCopy interface. These tools manage several transfers per request, whereas as I now understand it the OGSA-DMI interface is intended to support essentially a single “one location to another” data transfer. So it seems more akin to a Web service layer atop a data transfer utility. For instance, it appears to be a candidate to sit in front of the GridFTP servers as a WS interface for the control channel. Also, it could be a candidate to replace srmCopy though without support for multiple transfers. But as I understand it, it would not be a candidate for a service that schedules multiple data transfers per request.	We can support multiple file transfers in one transaction in this spec but the scheduling of that is out of scope for this version of the spec . This is may be re-examined in a future versions of the spec.	Resolved
~~4.2~~		From section 3.2.1: “this version of the specification does not make use at all of the WSAddressing Endpoint Reference data structure” I don’t necessarily have an issue with that decision. I just would like to have a better understanding of why it isn’t used. For instance, what made WSA EPR unsuitable for this specification? Also, given that the name used is “Data Endpoint Reference (DEPR)” and in fact the data structure looks superficially similar to the WS-Addressing EPR (figure under 4.2.1.2.1), this seems sure to cause confusion.	This is a typo in the spec. Have changed: "does not use at all of the ..." when it should say "does not use all of the ..." fixed	Resolved
~~4.3~~		From section 4.2.1.2.1: DataLocations/Credentials element I think this is a good choice to include a Credentials element nested in the DataLocations element of the DataEPR. Ideally though, I would have a default Credentials element elsewhere that could apply to both the source and sink DEPRs, perhaps in the [transfer requirements] parameter of the create DTI call. I think it’s likely that the user’s credential often will be the same for source and sink. By only having this element nested within the source and sink DEPRs results in significant overhead.	This is a valid point but we do not want to do this optimisation for this version of the spec.	Resolve
~~4.4~~		From section 4.2.1.3.1: EndNoLaterThan element The EndNoLaterThan setting could be problematic. Does a user really want to abort a transfer that is 99% complete? Is this feature mapped to a real user requirement? But if it is needed, why not just use the WS-ResourceLifetime TerminationTime interface?	The element is nillable so that an end time does not have to be specified explicitly. The EndNoLaterThan element may be use to indicate an end time if a user deems to be necessary even if his transfer is 99.9% complete. In a WSRF rendering this will be mapped to the WS-ResourceLifetime TerminationTime, etc.	Resolved
~~4.5~~		From section 5.2: Support for Stop or Suspend Not all transfer protocols will be able to support the stop or suspend operations. In such cases, I suppose the DTI state becomes failed:unclean or perhaps the service returns an exception . I am not clear on that.	We have some state in the core state model that may not be supported - added the faultRequestedStateNotSupported Fault to section 5.3.4 .	Resolved
~~4.6~~		General comment: Extensions It seems like there will be a lot of usage of the any elements to extend the interface. For instance, I can see [transfer requirements] being used for GridFTP specific settings like streams and buffer size in order to tune GridFTP transfers. While the nterface specification appears well defined and it is good to limit its scope, in practice the extended, implementation-dependent elements could be significant and undermine the objective of interoperability. That’s more of a concern than an objection.	This allows for a controlled way of providing extensions - can standardise extensions through the use of profiles at some later point to ensure interoperability of these.	Resolved
~~4.7~~		General comment: Support for notifications I don’t see support for notifications or is WS-Notification an interface that implementations of the specification can optionally support. As much as possible, it would be good for the specification to reduce the need for client roundtrips, e.g. getting a state notification instead of polling the DTI resource to check whether the transfer is done. In fact, adding a “callback” EPR in the create DTI call could be a good way to eliminate the need for the client to make a second remote call (following the first remote call to create the resource) to set up notifications, if notifications are to be supported.	We do not support notifications in the 1.0 core specifications but renderings may support notifications. Currently there is no agreed overall notification spec.	Resolved
~~5.1~~	Dave Berry	Overall: This is an important specification that plays a key part in the OGSA Data Architecture as well as being used standalone. It has the support of several major players. The specification seems sensibly scoped for a version 1.0 and is well written.	No action required.	Resolved
~~5.2~~		* Abstract "will be greatly reduced" -> "is greatly reduced"? "leverage off" -> "leverage"	These comments seem ok, have made the changes accoringly.	Resolved

~~5.3.1~~		* Introduction (opening section, before 1.1) I think you need to clarify that the DMI mechanism transfers a copy of the original data, i.e. that whether the source retains or deletes its copy is outside the scope of this specification. (Cf. POSIX "mv" vs "cp").	The spec does not specify whether the source will keep a copy of the data - have added an extra sentence to clarify this: What happens to the data at the source location once the data has been transferred is beyond the scope of this specification.	Resolved
~~5.3.2~~		* Introduction (opening section, before 1.1) I think the introduction should mention that the user can optionally specify a preferred or suggested transport protocol, i.e. the automatic negotiation is the ideal but can be bypassed if the client wishes.	A user has to specify a transfer protocol else it faults. There is no transport negotiation in this version of the spec.	Resolved
~~5.4~~		* Architecture First bullet points: the trailing "and" looks as if something has been omitted from that line. I assume the intention is to link to the second bullet point, but it does not read well. Perhaps a semicolon is needed before it?	Have removed the "and".	Resolved
~~5.5~~		Section 3.3.3 The DEPR, as described here, seems to contain similar functionality to a WS-Name. Can a DEPR be built using a WS-Name?	You can but the concepts are orthogonal - you would enrich the functionality but this is out of scope for this version of OGSA-DMI. Nevertheless, we are happy that WS-Names are composable with DEPRs.	Resolved
~~5.6.1~~		Section 4.1.2 I don't understand what is meant by "undo strategy identifiers look like URLs but they are not necessarily so". What is the characteristic of a URL beyond syntax that you are referring to? Why don't you just say that they are URIs?	Change URLs to URIs. They are URIs.	Resolved
~~5.6.2~~		Section 4.1.2 I also don't understand how the undo strategies relate to the "Failed:*" states. The "full" strategy says that cleanup is "guaranteed"; can this ever fail and leave the system in the "Failed:Unclean" or "Failed:Unknown" states? Conversely, can the "none" strategy every leave the system in the "Failed:Clean" state?	Section 4.1.2 has been re-written to clarify this.	Resolved
~~5.7~~		Section 5.2.7.1.1 "dmi:InstanceAtrributes" -> "dmi:InstanceAttributes"	Typo fixed.	Resolved
~~5.8~~		Section 5.4.1.8 "Failed:Unkown" -> "Failed:Unknown"	Typo fixed	Resolved
~~5.9~~		Section 5.4.2 It would be useful to repeat here that the mechanism for emitting LifeCycle Events is not defined in this version of the specification. When I read the document, I missed the initial explanation of events and was caught by surprise when I reached this section. Anyone jumping straight to this section wouldn't understand the context.	The paragraph earlier has been repeated to make this clearer.	Resolved
~~6~~	Shahbaz Memon	I dont have much to comment. But I can say the specification is well explained and understandable. For implementation, Grid middlewares providing services based on WSRF, the DMI's (WSRF) rendering will significantly be worth noting. Lets see how it comes.	No response neeed.	Resolved
~~7.1~~	Erwin Laure	In general, this is a well written spec suitable as version 1.0.	No action required.	
~~7.2~~		In Section 3, please be consistent with the names in the text and figure 1; for instance "Factory Port Type" of the figure should be "Data Transfer Factory Port Type" etc.	Added the "Data Transfer" words to the Factory and Instance portTypes.	Resolved
~~7.3~~		Section 4.1.1. requires an undo strategy for each supported protocol which is only described later in Section 4.1.2 - I would recommend to include Section 4.1.2 in 4.1.1	Advice followed.	Resolved
~~7.4~~		The specification of the different undy strategies in 4.1.2 should move to the XML representation (4.1.2.1) to be consistent with the discussion in 4.1.1	Advice followed.	Resolved
~~7.5~~		Section 4.2.1.2 (source and sink DEPR) would gain by providing one or two examples, for instance, how to render a gridftp DEPR or an SRM DEPR	Examples have been supplied in section 4.2.1.2.	Resolved
~~8~~	Clive Davenhall	The architecture developed by NextGRID (http://www.nextgrid.org/) relies on DMI for data transfer. It fulfils an important role in our architecture by providing a structure and interface for data transfer services. An important feature is that it separates the transfer resources from individual data transfer protocols, such as GridFTP, etc. It also provides the flexibility to support 'third-party' transfers, which are important for efficient implementations in Grid systems. Overall it is good stuff.	No action required.	Resolved
~~9.1~~	James Casey	Generally, I think the spec is well rounded and has the right scope for a 1.0 version of this subject.	No action required.	Resolved
~~9.2~~		pg6, para 2 "record the protocols that can be used". I didn't understand this well first time reading it (the usage of the word 'record'). Do you mean "query for the protocols", "negotiate the protocols"	Have clarified the text.	Resolved
~~9.3~~		pp12, 4.1.2.1 Typo dmi:UndoStratergy -> dmi:UndoStrategy	Typo fixed.	Resolved