

Title: Comments for WSSG on the Service Registry

Date: Nov. 2008

Source: Bruce Bargmeyer, the Chair of SC32

Document Type: Comments for Resolution #34 & #35 at JTC1 Plenary, Gold Coast, Nov., 2007.

Reference: JTC1 N8804

Attachment: Presentation slide: "Requirements for Standardization on the Service Registries", SC32

Body:

SC32 had reviewed the web site of WSSG and discussed the current situation and future requirements to the international standardization of the Service Registry.

Problems identified on Current Service Registry:

SC32 recognized the importance of the service registry. However, SC32 wishes that some of common problems regarding the registries as followed should be concerned at the study of the service registry.

1. Concentration of Maintenance efforts
2. Concentration of RA (Registration Authority)
3. Difficulty on the tracking changes or versions
4. Difficulty on assurance of ID or URI persistency
5. Small returns on the registration efforts at users
6. How to differentiate from Google or Yahoo

To resolve some problems above, SC32 aware of the new standards for "Automatic Syndication of Registries" need to be developed at some other SDO.

Preferable Approach to the standardization of registries

(1)Taxonomy of the Registries

It should be recognize that there are so many varieties of the registry standards in both ISO and Industry consortia according to the domains. Also, it should be recognized that the Web service technologies will cover all of aspect of current existing registry standards in the future. However, SC32 wishes to resolve questions that current different types of registry standards, such as the ebXML registries to support BtoB business, are still needed in the future or not.

Another question is that in order to accommodate wide spread heterogeneous registry implementations that were developed with different standards or own manners, some other standards such as ROR (Registry of Registries) or the federation of registries are needed or not.

Then, to clarify requirements to the Service Registry standards, some common taxonomical view to the registry types (Type-1 ~ Type-3) might be needed to be investigated in discussions of those standardizations (see attachment for more details).

- Type-1: Dedicated specialized domain registries (User: 10^2)
- Type-2: Cross domain registries (User: 10^{3-4})
- Type-3: Discovery of service (User: 10^{6-8})

(2) Requirements on the Standardization

SC32 respects Web service technologies, such as WSDL, UDDI, SOAP and some other W3C technologies. However, to accomplish purposes of the SC32 scope that is “Data management and Interchange”, SC32 needs some standards for more contents oriented Service Definitions as mandatory extensions of current existing registry standards, such as ISO/IEC 11179 and ISO/IEC19763.

(3) Leadership of JTC1 on the coordination of inter PAS SDO

It is clear that standardization in this area should be proceeded by the PAS procedure, then, it is needed to organize and coordinate SDOs in both ISO & Industrial consortia more widely.

SC32 had initiated study projects in WG2 at the Sydney Plenary, May 2008, to investigate possibility of standardization on topics, such as “ROR” and “metamodel for definition of services”. Then, it is appreciated if SC32 could share study results with the WSSG.