



TERENA Technical Committee Meeting

24 November 2011

Valentino Cavalli

Participants

Valentino Cavalli (VC), TTC secretary

Christoph Graf (CG), VP Technical Programme & TTC chairman

David Kelsey (DK)

Jan Meijer (JM)

Ligia Maria Ribeiro (LR)

Esther Robles (ER)

Karel Vietsch (KV)

TERENA Staff

Laura Durnford (LD)

John Dyer (JD)

Anthony Hodges (AH)

Kevin Meynell (KM)

Brook Schofield (BS)

Peter Szegedi (PS)

Apologies

Licia Florio (LF)

Josh Howlett (JH)

1. Welcome and Apologies

Christoph Graf welcomed the participants and started the meeting. Apologies were provided by Licia Florio and Josh Howlett.

2. Agenda

The agenda was approved. Due to Josh absence it was agreed to have a presentation from DK on the workshop "Federated Identity Management for Scientific Collaborations" that was held at the Rutherford Appleton Lab (RAL) on 3 November 2011.

3. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

4. Review of Outstanding Action Points

Reference	Who	Action	Status
20110317-1	DK	to develop and expand the idea of bridging between PKI and SAML federations as a way of supporting the Grid community.	Presentation and discussion added as agenda item 10.1
20110317-2	VC	to prepare more flexible TTC meeting agenda in the future.	Ongoing – Action closed
20110317-3	TTC	to discuss SIA issues in November.	In agenda, item 6
20110621-1	JD BS	to make sure that proper follow up on 3G/4G collaboration takes place in TF-MSP, TF-Mobility and in the ASPIRE project.	Action started
20110621-2	VC JD PS TTC	VC, JD, PS and relevant TTC member to organise a community meeting for a common cloud initiative by end October 2011.	In agenda, item 7
20110621-3	VC	to make sure that the question on networking architects is taken up in the list of topics to discuss in bilateral phone calls between MT members and TERENA member organisations.	Done
20110621-3	VC, TF secr.	TF secretaries to meet and prepare a cross task force coordination meeting aiming at September.	Done. Report in agenda, item 5

Table 1: Actions from Previous Meetings

20110621-1 The next TF-MSP meeting in February 2012 would also focus on mobility. Mobility has also been selected as the theme of one of the ASPIRE sub-studies. JD said he is looking after both activities. He reported that he had presented at the latest TF-MNM meeting in Bologna, where ideas about 3G/4G collaboration were discussed.

20110621-3. VC reported that the question was taken up in bilateral talks between members of the TERENA secretariat Management Team and representatives of TERENA member organisations that took place in the summer. The feedback was generally encouraging and TERENA would follow up by organising a

workshop on next generation network architectures.

CG reminded the TTC participants of the original ideas he had presented at the TAC meeting in Prague. He felt that there is a gap in the exchange of information among NREN planning and operational staff concerning their national activities.

Incidentally, JD mentioned that TF-MSP wishes to develop a matrix of services offered by NRENs. He felt that Nordic NRENs have done an excellent job at documenting their service portfolio and was hoping that other NRENs would be able to share similar information, but, JD said, getting information at European level is challenging.

Further discussions about the scope and nature of the workshop took place. It was clarified that the event would not focus on services per-se. Understanding what services NRENs provide would be just a preliminary input to the discussion on how to architect their networks in the future. For instance, whether a service is meant to serve tens or hundreds of nodes has an influence on the network architecture itself.

Some ideas about the format of the workshop were also discussed. The workshop should offer a forum for open discussion, but the first part could consist of a set of flash talks to provide the background for further discussion. Some of the issues the participants would be asked to highlight are where their network is positioned with respect to its lifecycle, what are the services and the customers these are targeting, how things are organised from a network architecture viewpoint to support these services.

JM said that potential participants from UNINETT would be operational people.

PS said that there seemed to be some synergy with TF-NOC and that one could start to organise the workshop by approaching that community. However, it was remarked that there is no perfect match between TF-NOC and the intended audience. It was suggested that TF-NOC is one of the channels, whilst another channel is NREN managers. These could help identifying the network planning/architects in their organisations. An information should be sent to GA representatives to identify these people.

It was suggested that as part of the workshop organisation it would be good to obtain feedback on the goals and contents of the event from those who would potentially attend (this might also include the appropriate date) first. It was agreed to sound out a few interested individuals before announcing the event to the email lists.

ACTION 20111124-1, PS, VC to start consultation and prepare for a network architects workshop.

5. Report on the task force coordination meeting and mechanism

Following up from action 20110621-3 a meeting of all task-force chairs and secretaries was held at the TERENA office on 21 September 2011. VC reported that the meeting had been very engaging for the participants, it helped identifying synergy and cross-task force collaboration topics and led to the establishment of a permanent mechanism for coordination at the level of chairs and secretaries.

The meeting agenda was structured in such a way to facilitate reaching the objective. To focus discussion and identify common interests the themes of Cloud services and Mobility were chosen. Among the main outcome were:

- Synergy between TF-MSP, TF-Storage and TF-EMC2 concerning cloud services. Both in the area of SaaS and IaaS. All participants felt the need to involve security experts as well.

- TF-MSP contributed to the TF-MNM meeting that was held in Bologna on 8-9 November.
- TF-MNM, TF-EMC2 and TF-NOC would explore the synergy relating to monitoring and diagnostics of services such as eduroam, etc.
- TF-Media and TF-Storage have both an interest in looking at "mobility" of content across the network. CDN and Virtualisation are relevant topics and it should be investigated whether these could be taken up in the next ToR of those task forces.

The following main action points were agreed at the meeting and followed up: task force chairs and secretaries to be subscribed to a specific tf-coord email list for exchange of information and further collaboration; VC to organise regular (3 times/year) videoconferencing meetings; VC to relate to those responsible for TNC in order to ensure stronger visibility to the work of task forces.

CG said he had heard positive feedback about the meeting and welcomed this collaboration.

JM asked whether colocation of task force meetings was discussed. VC said many concrete suggestions had been discussed and started to act upon. He added that a potential problem might be that some task forces have rather standard agendas, whereas others are more thematic. In the case of the former ones it might be difficult to identify specific co-location opportunities.

LD said that NRENs participating in TF-CPR are normally asked to report on their national priorities and was wondering if similar questions could be asked in other task forces. JM felt it was very interesting to do that. He felt this could also provide an incentive for translating national/organisational priority documents into English and make them available to a wider audience. CG said that SWITCH does not have a document that can be considered as putting those priorities together; however, it was generally thought a good idea to ask task force chairs to get that information.

Action 20111124-2 VC to consult LD and send message to tf-coord email list to ask the question about national priorities.

Action 20111124-3 MT consider having a question on national priorities in the next round of talks with TERENA member representatives.

LD pointed TTC members to the TF-CPR compendium.

LR said mentioned an option to consider co-locating the next TF-MNM/TF-EMC2 meeting with the EUNIS conference in Vila Real, Portugal on 20-22 June 2012. Some comments were made that a face to face task force meeting earlier in the year would be a better option.

ACTION 20111124-4 VC, BS liaise with TF-EMC2 and TF-MNM chairs to investigate options for earlier or alternative face-to-face meeting.

JM and VC engaged in a discussion and concluded that virtual collaboration/alternatives to face-to-face meetings are becoming normal and accepted ways of collaborating nowadays. TF-MNM, TF-EMC2 and other task forces had held such meetings successfully and there was more and more will to meet this way.

6. Discussion on revising the function and relevance of having Special Interest Areas

VC provided TTC members with some contextual information to start the discussion. Special Interest Areas (SIA) have a prominent role in the Terms of Reference of the TERENA technical programme (www.terena.org/about/tech/). According to the rules there should be a maximum of six SIAs and these should be revised by the Technical Advisory Council (TAC) every second year. However, SIAs have always been too general for providing a significant input to the work of TERENA. At the same time, the limitation to six meant that for a number of years convoluted ways of capturing more areas that are relevant for the work of TERENA had to be found. As a result most of the discussions at TAC meetings have often been much more formal than substantial. In practice SIAs have never managed to provide real added value to TERENA's work nor served the purpose of defining clear guidelines for that work. The feedback after the TAC meeting in Vilnius, where SIAs were last discussed, was not very positive and the TTC had agreed to revise the relevance and usefulness of having SIA in this meeting (Action 20110317-3).

Yearly TERENA activity plans are a more specific and flexible way to meet community needs than SIAs. VC argued that SIAs are redundant for the work of TERENA and proposed to get rid of them.

Besides that, in the past years TERENA's work in management, business, and other areas – although still with a clear technical component – had increased significantly, whereas activities went well beyond the limits of task forces and projects, that strictly speaking make all of the Technical Programme. VC expressed the intention to revise the Terms of Reference of the Technical Programme so that this can provide a more suitable framework for any technical aspect across all TERENA activities. Changes to the Technical Programme would also entail changes in the role of the TTC and the TAC.

Additional contextual information was given by CG and KM. Christoph shared with the TTC a document highlighting the TERENA strategic goals. Getting rid of SIAs does not mean that TERENA would not set priorities for its work. However those priorities should be developed in accordance to the strategy and the annual activity plans.

KM recalled that he had been involved in the definition of the ToR of the Technical Programme more than a decade ago. He said the original idea about the SIAs was a way of giving everybody in the TTC a clear responsibility. Originally TTC members were the chairs of TERENA working groups; when working groups were abolished SIAs were created to maintain this function. There were six working groups at that time and the limit of six SIAs was imposed with the purpose of maintaining the function of the working group chairs of that time.

CG said is definitely good to have areas to focus priorities on, but the SIAs as they are don't fulfil the purpose. He added that in the past TERENA's work was more technology driven, whilst now it needs to address more the user value. In other words, he felt, the customer, not the technology, should be the focus.

LD asked whether making priorities more visible to the community is a communication matter. According to VC it is, but not only, because those priorities are not clearly identified yet. CG added that priorities could be discussed with TAC participants at their annual meeting.

Action 20111124-5 VC to follow up on the revision of the ToR of the technical programme and report to the next TTC meeting.

7. Developments concerning Cloud initiative

JD organised a Cloud Panel meeting in Amsterdam in October to follow up on action 20110621-2. The meeting was not well attended but participants gave clear indications on which direction to move. Agreed actions were to follow up in a FP7 project proposal, in one of the ASPIRE sub-studies and in a pilot initiative supported by TERENA – to provide interface to a number of Cloud service providers based on a project from Maarten Koopmans/Sigma – and finally in offering a single-stop shop for Clouds (add a Cloud activity section on the TERENA website).

It was asked whether work would be based on resources NRENSs own or resources that have to come from commercial offers. JD said potentially any available resource would be used. JM provided some details on Maarten's project. The key of that project is to separate information about what you store from where you actually store it.

DK asked what was the purpose of the TERENA pilot. He was concerned that TERENA does not talk with many other people in EU projects, EGI etc. This is an area where TERENA must engage with all stakeholders, not with NRENSs only. JD said the idea was not only making a practical demonstrator but most of all a way of understanding the requirements of our community. The TTC recommended to involve stakeholders and look at different models, in order to understand requirements and make sure that TERENA stays on top of developments.

PS provided some information on the initiative started by some TF-Storage participants to work on a proposal for the FP7 call closing on 17 January 2012. He briefly mentioned the status of the proposal, its goals, partners, resources,. One focus would be on interoperability, another on integration of campus infrastructure with Clouds. The proposal would address the missing link in the middle.

8. ToR of TF-Media

Draft ToR for TF-Media were sent to the TTC in advance of the meeting. PS went through the text of the new ToR. He said participants in the last meeting in Porto had discussed how to continue and agreed to shift the focus of the task force on how media tools impact on teaching and learning and the role of NRENSs in this area. The new task force would still be called TF-Media but meaning "applied media in teaching and learning". It was added that people did not explicitly address e-learning but were interested in looking at that.

PS provided a bird's eye view of the various work items, explaining which ones are more under the "ownership" of NRENSs (technology, back-end solutions, harmonize metadata content archives, integrating tools to support learning and teaching) which ones of institutions. On the

promotion side, one idea was to create a wikipedia page on TF-Media. Participants were also keen on using virtual tools to support ongoing collaboration, with a view on making the task force a virtual place always open for people to exchange information/work together. PS continued by mentioning the WI leaders, Interested participants and NRENs institutions involved. He added that Level3 is interested in providing services to the TF-Media community in the area of CDNs.

CG, JM, DK liked the refocus, although CG felt that from the WI list the task force looked still quite technology oriented. JM said there is a role TF-Media can play in supporting services/applications in terms of governance.

As in other task forces, also in TF-Media there is a core group of people who are regularly involved plus some who contribute occasionally. PS showed some charts about presentations at TF meetings (TF-Storage, TF-NOC and TF-Media) that show quite similar patterns.

CG recommended to watch out for e-Learning scenarios and see if they can become relevant for the work of this group. He added that repositories for those e-Learning objects and relation with other repositories are also interesting. PS said mostly institutions rather than NRENs are interested in repositories. CG was wondering if there was anything related to data repositories/life cycle/preservation. VC said data repositories have not been addressed in TERENA work but they could potentially soon become relevant if the response sent by TERENA to a Commission tender for a AAA was approved.

9. Terms of office of TTC members

The second and last term of LR and DK would expire on 19 December 2011. They cannot be reappointed. Christoph thanked David and Ligia for their participation in the TTC. CG said some thoughts had been given in the past into possible new TTC members and the task of finding successors had now become urgent.

CG said that the appointment of DK and LR explicitly addressed two communities (Grids and campuses) that were considered strategic for TERENA. Similarly, he proposed to identify candidates addressing the same communities plus others that weren't currently represented in the TTC. Suggestions were e-infrastructures (including Grids), libraries, media and campuses. Some names in those areas had been suggested earlier on. The meeting participants exchanged views on a list of candidates. JM said he would ask for additional suggestions to a colleague who is in close contact with the research community. CG and VC would follow up promptly and aim at approaching people so that they could be appointed in the TERENA Executive Committee meeting of 15 December 2011.

ACTION. 20111124-6 VC, CG to finalise the list of TTC candidates and follow up on time for the TEC meeting to appoint new members in their December meeting.

10. Updates

10.1 Report on the "Federated Identity Management for Scientific Collaborations"

workshop

This item was added to the agenda of the meeting as a follow up from action 20110317-1. DK reported on the "Federated Identity Management for Scientific Collaborations" workshop that was held at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory (RAL) in the UK on 3 November 2011.

DK reminded TTC members on what the European E-Infrastructures Forum (EEF) is and a number of workshops that were called by Bob Jones (the first one being held at CERN in June 2011) with the goal of obtaining input from several communities to the definition of a common vision for federated identity management. TERENA had been invited to the first workshop. Although contacted at very short notice, Kevin Meynell attended the RAL event, whilst Licia Florio was able to participate via videoconference.

DK explained the common vision that was discussed at the meeting. The idea is to work towards a common policy and trust for identity management based on existing e-Infrastructures and existing federations. He presented the elements that should be addressed by this common work. This includes support for multiple technologies, openness and scalability, privacy and confidentiality. Important issues regard attribute exchange and attribute aggregation. A number of operational issues need to be addressed, including risk analysis, traceability, security, user friendliness and reliability. Other important aspects of the vision are SLAs between communities and federations and need for an agreed funding model. DK said the communities represented in the workshop should be encouraged to engage with REFEDS.

The next workshop was announced to be co-located with ISGC2012 in Taipei on 26 February 2012.

VC reported that he had been informed by Licia that a REFEDS meeting would be held at APAN 33 on 13-17 February 2012 in Chiang Mai, Thailand, and felt it was unfortunate that REFEDS and the next workshop, which might benefit from stronger synergy, would take place at such short time from one another, apparently with none of the two groups being informed of each other's plan.

CG felt that one of the reasons why the REFEDS group and the community behind these workshops don't match is the different remit. AAI started nationally and are mostly nationally in scope although they have increasingly extended across border with interfederations (REFEDS). On the other hand, researchers focus primarily on their discipline and research topics, which are not confined within national borders. DK agreed with this view but felt this was making an even stronger case for these communities to talk and find a way of "meeting in the middle".

LR said one should look at federations for education, not only for research. She said it is important for students to access remotely university facilities by using federated identities. She mentioned that a lot of work takes place in Germany at the moment. CG agreed with Ligia. There are more communities who would need to make use of AAI

BS liability issues related to moving data around cross border is a barrier for the eduGAIN service as well. JM said there also inhibitors related to different attitudes/different language that make it difficult for IdPs and SPs to understand each other.

JM said international researchers/user communities should be involved in the discussion (REFEDS) on harmonization of federations.

CG felt it is time to move from talking about attribute consumption to something that SPs (and users) can understand. He suggested that there are use cases in the area of e-Learning. JM was wondering if this could be a subject for EuroCAMP. BS said this is possibly something to address at that level. Generally, JM felt that there is an awareness raising problem at the user community level. CG argued the importance of catering for these users. It's essential to be able to provide what they need if something similar to the episode that led ESA to choose an alternative infrastructure to GEANT has to be avoided. TTC members felt that TERENA should address awareness raising/communication to those users in a more assertive way.

ACTION 20111124-7 LF talk to Bob Jones in order to explore ways of engaging between REFEDS and the user communities represented in the EEF as well as to better coordinating the organisation of respective events in the future.

Communication should be both ways, not only the user communities need to be targeted. It is also essential for TERENA to influence its own community and make sure they understand these users are important. It was suggested to address this via TF-EMC2/REFEDS/eduGAIN

ACTION 20111124-8 LF, BS to address awareness raising on the Identity requirements of international research user groups at the level of TF-EMC2/REFEDS/eduGAIN.

ACTION 20111124-9 CG to address awareness raising on the Identity requirements of international research user groups at the level of TERENA GA.

10.2 Ipv6 support GnuGK

In the summer of 2011 TERENA launched the small project to provide IPv6 support to the GnuGK, an open source H.323 gatekeeper. TERENA managed to collect funding for the Jan Willamovwius, the GnuGK developer, to do that work. TERENA signed contracts with sponsoring NRENs and the developer in August. The work was completed and results are now publicly available. The software can be downloaded at:
<http://openh323gk.cvs.sourceforge.net/openh323gk/openh323gk/>

10.3 NRENum.net service

PS attended a ENUM working group meeting at the last RIPE conference. During the latest Internet2 meeting in Raleigh he had also talked with people from Internet2, AARNET and North Carolina University to get some more global participation in the NRENum.net service. These contacts started to pay off. At the time of the TTC meeting two new European NRENs (Latvia and Serbia) had joined the service, whilst Australia was considering joining the European tree.

The educonf service of GEANT wants to solve the numbering issue too. There had been discussion on a GSD (GEANT Short Dialing) mechanism. This discussion triggered a proposal from PS to use NRENum.net to populate all GDS (Global Dialing System) numbers under a non-used number in the NRENum.net tree. The proposal was received positively by Rui Ribeiro, the

leader of educonf. Details were still being discussed but PS felt that there were good chances for the proposal to be accepted.

CG said he was getting conflicting signals about ENUM. It looks like ENUM does not have a clear future simply because there are not enough use cases. In Switzerland at least there was no usage so ENUM was discontinued. After adding more detail on the RIPE meeting, BS pointed TTC members to the .at service and suggested looking at that as example.

11. Dates of Next Meetings

It was provisionally agreed to hold the next TTC meeting at the TERENA office on Tuesday, 6 March 2012.

12. AoB

TTC members were wondering if the talks with Microsoft, Amazon, Google, IBM that JD had planned in the context of the ASPIRE study had taken place. JD said he had talked with representatives from all of them in the summer but unfortunately there had been no follow up yet. It appeared that such companies are not much interested in doing business with an organisation speaking on behalf of its members. JM mentioned that a similar situation happened in Norway: rather than taking to UNINETT, firms preferred to make deals directly with institutions. It was remarked that this phenomenon seems to clash significantly with the statement made at other occasions by some of the same companies, that they prefer to talk and make deals with one single organisation instead of many. CG said that he had heard that the problem lies in the lack of appropriate structure at European level to be able to ensure proper business follow up.

TTC members and TERENA secretariat staff thanked Ligia Maria Ribeiro and David Kelsey for their participation in the TTC for two consecutive terms.

13. Open Actions

Reference	Who	Action	Status
20111124-1	PS, VC	to start consultation and prepare for a network architects workshop.	NEW
20111124-2	VC	to consult LD and send message to tf-coord email list to ask the question about national priorities.	NEW
20111124-3	MT	consider having a question on national priorities in the next round of talks with TERENA member representatives.	NEW
20111124-4	VC, BS	liaise with TF-EMC2 and TF-MNM chairs to investigate options for earlier or	NEW

		alternative face-to-face meeting.	
20111124-5	VC	to follow up on the revision of the ToR of the technical programme and report to the next TTC meeting.	NEW
20111124-6	VC, CG	to finalise the list of TTC candidates and follow up on time for the TEC meeting to appoint new members in their December meeting.	NEW
20111124-7	LF	talk to Bob Jones in order to explore ways of engaging between REFEDS and the user communities represented in the EEF as well as to better coordinating the organisation of respective events in the future.	NEW
20111124-8	LF, BS	to address awareness raising on the Identity requirements of international research user groups at the level of TF-EMC2/REFEDS/eduGAIN.	NEW
20111124-9	CG	to address awareness raising on the Identity requirements of international research user groups at the level of TERENA GA.	NEW

Table 2: Open Actions