

2022-08-01 Architecture WG Meeting Notes

Date

01 Aug 2022

Antitrust Policy

Antitrust Policy Notice

Linux Foundation meetings involve participation by industry competitors, and it is the intention of the Linux Foundation to conduct all of its activities in accordance with applicable antitrust and competition laws. It is therefore extremely important that attendees adhere to meeting agendas, and be aware of, and not participate in, any activities that are prohibited under applicable US state, federal or foreign antitrust and competition laws.

Examples of types of actions that are prohibited at Linux Foundation meetings and in connection with Linux Foundation activities are described in the Linux Foundation Antitrust Policy available at <http://www.linuxfoundation.org/antitrust-policy>. If you have questions about these matters, please contact your company counsel, or if you are a member of the Linux Foundation, feel free to contact Andrew Updegrove of the firm of Gesmer Updegrove LLP, which provides legal counsel to the Linux Foundation.



Attendees:

- Sean Bohan (openIDL)
- Jeff Braswell (openIDL)
- David Reale (Travelers)
- Peter Antley (AAIS)
- Dale Harris (AAIS)
- Satish Kasala (Hartford)
- Ken Sayers (AAIS)

Agenda:

1. Continue discussion - Architecture & Scenarios
 - a. [openIDL - Architecture Definition Workspace](#) (NEW)
2. Previous Discussions
 - a. [openIDL - System Requirements Table](#)
 - b. [openIDL - Policies](#)
 - c. [openIDL - Operating Roles](#)

Notes:

- KS
 - Architecture we can implement
 - Simple deployment plan on top of Arch (devops)
 - JB & PA process of standing up node, starting on deployment pattern
 - Not simple, end goal should be easy to stand up and take a look at
 - What are the artifacts we can work on
 - Arch Diagram, Technical Architecture, lot of opinions on what is useful (interaction diagrams, etc.)

- Thoughts?
 - Scenario Review
 - How to capture - notes as we go will suffice and org as we go into something that works for all
 - Satish-Hartford, David/Dale - Travelers, LF (network)
- DR - not go too far w/o buy-in/check from folks at Hanover, only other entity besides Travelers and Hartford, need engagement / buy-in
- SK - process, already had some baseline architecture defined/started then went into requirements, thinking go back, this is what we had/reqs and define gaps?
- KS - wouldn't consider what we had a thing to migrate from (then-now), not in production, don't think start from old arch as start from what we can accomplish
- DR - utilize what has been done but as we need pieces as proven out, but don't reference old at the beginning
- SK - need to lay out the, define, bottom up or top down? Top down, intentional arch (dir we want to head towards / Bottom up look at each component, build up component by comp)
- KS - don't have components to build up w/ right now - have to start from high level what are we trying to accomplish, put rough comp in place, address sequentially, too many arch really hard, lots of directions, get thru problem statement, what accomplish and then draw the diagram, dig in from the top
- DR - interaction diagram, stem from that, how works, then necessitates top down, don't want any mandates from component level that translate up
- SK - how we approach, making sure, if we go top down, we normally create intentional diagram
- KS - no assumptions - state them
- SK - intentional architecture - this are the major pieces of the puzzle and how laid out, broad brush, ex: Carrier node, what does it contain, HDS what does it contain and do, Analytics Node components
- KS - application arch here, not enterprise arch, little different than funct breakdown, extract common pieces out, figure out funct components from scenarios (load data, access data, create report)
- DR - more of where you have cross disciplinary or cross enterprise to standardize or unify - little overkill for this, don't get too bogged down in nomenclature and methodology, lets go as low overhead as possible - what we want it to do and do it, don't be too methodology-driven not dogmatic
- DH - there are subscriptions to data calls, agreeing to do it, annual, repeated each year (some 1/4 some monthly), have many similar data calls across states, state dictating what and how they want it
- KS - diff channel? direct? stat reporters?
- DH - use data call team, sep from Stat Reporters
- PA - broken out because asking questions not in stat plan?
- DH - stat plans so much info, hard to navigate thru (sources)
- PA - easier to answer question than go thru Stat Report team
- DR - funct, subscription is automating a piece of the arch - consent could add feature (annually, quarterly, annual, etc.) - captured by some consent and how given - automation on both sides, person issuing could automate theirs, receipt automate theirs - doesn't change underlying arch, same pipes and worker stuff
- DH - does order matter?
- DR - menu of data so to speak, lot of data calls designed to leverage whats there, data might be there before subscription,
- KS - data call model, tenet of the openIDL is the data is there why build it again
- DR - could see Subscribe to Report occur after data load, then again, we will load data before subscribe
- PA - loading something about ABS breaks on every record
- KS - wouldn't load any data if you didn't sub to any reports, not sequential set
- PA - ETL and networking ops too disconnected processes - process of loading and making data avail is sep from scenarios of "how to utilize openIDL to fulfill data requests"
- KS - disjointed, don't have to do one or the other but CANT do reporting without loading data
- DR - open account you don't intend to use, you could do, doesn't make sense but you could - start w/ scenario, state assumptions - simplify - "HDS is created and some data in it" good base assumption?
- KS - workflow? pre and post condition?
- DH - scenario determines whats in HDS
- DR - a check, is data there "Y/N", scenario is and is not, assume that for the scenarios these are operational scenarios, assume some pipes are built, operating as intended, day1 some doesn't exist but operating on Day 2 and work backwards
- KS - scenarios - assume all is working
- will be a check, scenario to work thru "is data there? no? load data"
- SK - Day 2? when does the check happen?
- DR - to be decided, talk early that every time write data to HDS assume data is there, could make arch such that theres data in HDS, maintained to some level of accuracy, when extracted a check "Y/N", there will be trivial cases for stat reporting where most likely that will be trivial (all planning for it) but there will be scenarios unknown
- JB - specific ation of a data call - stat reports repeat, know there, when comes to servicing data calls, one of your upfront cases is how do you define?
- KS - sep between data calls (asserted to being there) and stat reports (based on known data)
- DR - simplifies to the trivial, process the same, expected success is higher, extend to a check to show data is there, not necessarily leads to a data call - if someone makes a data call, makes request, checks meta data or funct we need, way for us to allow that
- JB - inquiry,
- DR - ping to see if there, has data needed? might be funct helpful to regulators to benefit of carrier to tailor data calls to whats there - these elements satisfy answers Reg wants, every carrier has it, can do that w/o Carriers exposing data early, telling them it is possible
- DH - say data is there fields populated, but "as of Jan 1"
- DR - if data call says "I need data Q3 Q4 2019 - data call provides success criteria - funct would have to live in carrier environment, don't expose data until proper auth, don't want to do, is don't want to burden Regs to get buyin from all carriers if thats possible and demand "keep putting more data in" and see "I can answer my question" without having to put more data in - are there enough carriers? if thats the only way they can tell the data is there, will make them frontload work and then ask the question but if they can ask the question in a lightweight way, not actual data -
- JB - would support notion of defining metadata of what is asked for
- DR - where does that live? in the query? in the adapter? part of it
- JB - some distributed metadata concept for R to fashion query if he knows its defined in the system
- KS - what the "LIKE" does right now, but not tied to current arch
- DR - kind of like the light but programmatic but deeper than a like, structured query that answers "its possible"

Time	Item	Who	Notes

Documentation:

1. [openIDL - Architecture - Member Requirements Files](#)
2. [Regulatory Reporting Requirements from Dale H - VERSION 1](#) (Travelers)
3. [Regulatory Reporting Requirements from Dale H - VERSION 2](#) (Travelers)
4. [Regulatory Reporting Requirements from Dale H - VERSION 3](#) (Travelers)
5. [Architecture WG Requirements Table](#)
6. [HDS Requirements WIP](#) (JamesM @ Travelers)

Notes: (Notes taken live in Requirements document)

Recording:



openIDL_ArchWG...2022_video.mp4