

# SACM Terminology

Virtual Interim @ Sep 24th

Henk Birkholz / Jarret Lu

# General

- Composing terminology can be parallelized well
- Focus on support for operational drafts
- Ongoing
- Housekeeping (travis, git content, thx Jim!)
  - More cleanup?
- These slides are structured as follows:  
Roles, Data Model, Operations,  
Homogeneity / Consistency

# SACM Roles

- Component Roles: Controller, Provider, Consumer
  - Implied by functions (not a classic role as in RBAC?)
  - Every SACM Component has a role (yes?)
- What about Endpoint Roles?
  - Target Endpoint
  - Excluded Endpoint („not a target endpoint“)
  - The hybrid (Target Endpoint with SACM component)
- New term: SACM Domain?

# SACM Data Model

- Seems to be targeted at “internal data model”
- What about “payload data model”
  - Example: Mile WG exchange formats
    - is this covered by the intended transport protocol?  
(editor thinks: probably not?)
  - RFC 3444 does not seem to provide guidance here
    - Would parallel operational drafts regarding potential SACM exchange formats require a corresponding information model? (to make them interoperable)
    - (If:) Is this intended to be covered by the current SACM IM?

# SACM operations

- Control plane & data plane operations
  - E.g. xmppGrid draft provides a set of control plane operations
    - E.g. Subscriptions or registering a publisher
- Are there additional data plane operations needed?
  - (If:) where would they go?
- Goal: Interoperable solution drafts

# Homogeneity / Consistency

- Is it desirable to process all “content”, e.g. guidance, policies (or expected state), attributes events, the same way?
  - E.g. same set/template of operations
- Is redundancy okay?
  - E.g. a custom xmppgrid topic and a equivalent “payload type attribute” in the payload transported via that topic?
  - (If:) How would consistency be assured?