



Report on TERENA Technical Advisory Council (TAC) Meeting 21 May 2012

Reykjavik, Iceland

Valentino Cavalli, version 1.

The Technical Advisory Council consists of senior technical managers of the TERENA member organisations. It has as its tasks to review the progress of the TERENA Technical Programme, advise on its future direction and propose new initiatives.

Christoph Graf welcomed the participants and introduced the agenda of the meeting:

1. Review-follow up from previous TAC meeting
 - 1.1 Cloud Services
 - 1.2 Interacting with network researchers
 - 1.3 NREN Network Service Innovation
2. Requirements of international e-science user groups, how NRENs and TERENA should respond to them?
3. Collaboration on security infrastructure in addition to TF-CSIRT is there a gap for TERENA to close?

Presentations were given as introduction to each agenda item. They are available at:

<http://www.terena.org/about/tac/20110516-presentations.html>

1. Review-follow up from previous TAC meeting

The goal of this session was to assess the functioning of TERENA technical work by looking back at the discussion from the previous TAC meeting in Prague in 2011 and see how the outcome of that meeting had developed in follow up actions. Christoph Graph went through the discussion topics one by one.

1.1 The first item was the role of TERENA in Cloud services. Christoph started by recalling the points suggested by Jan Meijer and summarising the feedback from the participants in the 2011 TAC meeting. TAC participants last year were in favour of an evolutionary approach to community Cloud services, although they acknowledged that small or national scale was not the end. Another major point was to leverage the role of federations and trust. TERENA main developments in the follow up were the Trusted Cloud Drive Pilot and one of the sub-studies of ASPIRE.

The Trusted Cloud Drive Pilot started in March 2012, the first phase, lasting two months, consisted of a pilot set up at the TERENA secretariat office; this was going to be demonstrated at TNC. The second phase was going to start immediately after TNC; NRENs would be able to join the pilot during that phase.

The ASPIRE study includes a report on Cloud services and this was expected to be delivered soon. A BoF to expose the preliminary results of ASPIRE was scheduled at TNC, too.

Richard Hughes-Jones asked whether TERENA had been discussing Cloud related matters with EGI. TERENA had some exchange with EGI but not on this specific topic and Richard suggested consulting them and discuss issues they have had. It was also reminded that Michel Drescher would talk about the EGI experience on their Cloud infrastructure platform at TNC.

Some TAC participants said they appreciate the direction the work has taken. Alberto Perez said it was not clear if NRENS have the possibility to address funding issues related to Cloud services. More specifically, he pointed at the need to clarify how to coordinate between the national and the European levels. David Foster added that the main issue is that with Cloud services the community is entering a competitive market, but it is not clear who is going to buy those services and how. Andrew Cormack remarked the usefulness of the Trusted Cloud Drive pilot as it seems to provide a complementary top-down approach to the EGI experience.

It was generally remarked that identify potential users of community Cloud Services was possibly a good output of the pilot. Indeed the Helix Nebula project was trying to do that, too.

HEANet were planning to adopt a strategy relating to clouds and were interested in talking with other NRENS.

Lars Fischer said NRENS should make sure that in the next years they can work together in monitor and coordinate work together: John Dyer mentioned the *nren-clouds@terena.org* email list as a possible means to serve that purpose. In addition Lars felt that maybe a workshop should be organised.

1.2 The second item discussed last year in Prague was the role of TERENA in supporting Internet research. Christoph reported that one year on no coordinated activity was carried out and the interest of NRENS had not really become much clearer, although Internet research was still quite important and certainly high in the European Commission RTD agenda. Christoph was wondering if the community was willing to act together or it should be accepted that NRENS are not driving network research?

Victor Reijs said researchers in Ireland want to be a Future Internet node and HEANet wants to understand that interest and possibly support it.

Lars added that NRENS and TERENA have an outreach issue. FIRE projects are developing a lot of stuff, such as BoD etc, that has been going on in the Research and Education community for many years, apparently without being aware of those developments. He felt it very good that GÉANT has started to be present with a booth at FIRE conferences. Victor argued that indeed NRENS would be already able to provide what those research communities need.

Richard Hughes-Jones and Bartosz Belter felt it to be true that people are not aware, but warned also about the need to acknowledge that NRENS are not ready to fully match their needs yet. Those researchers don't need large pipes, but ways of controlling their networks – NRENS, GÉANT, DANTE and TERENA seem to be unprepared to that and probably need to extend their remit in order to support those users. Some of the main problems lie in providing

dynamic paths at last mile and there does not seem to be clear responsibility for that at the moment. Lars reinforced the need to be in contact with network research projects. Alberto supported the urge to stay in contact with them.

JD remarked that the issues involved had to be addressed by the business director in NRENs in addition to the technical staff.

Per Nihlén said NRENs also need to be well known by the CIOs, not only by the researchers.

David foster pointed at the cultural difference between partnering with the research community vis-a-vis maintaining a customer-supplier relationship with that community.

To reach a conclusion the question was asked: what does this all mean for TERENA. How can TERENA support that outreach? The solution, it was suggested, was to target specific research or disciplines, maintain and extend the dialogue with user/research communities. In which way should that dialogue be organised? It was remarked that the remit of individual NRENs is national and often larger research users operate across national boundaries. GÉANT has a role in the Liaison and Support Networking Activity (NA4/T3) and Richard suggested that TERENA could also play a role there for example by supporting consultation events.

Andrew built on the previous points by suggesting that TERENA could play a role in finding out what those communities are, in other words help mapping the landscape.

Conclusion: TERENA needs to develop a market analysis function and TERENA should actively join the GÉANT (and GN3+) activities that look into that.

1.3 The third and last discussion item of the Prague TAC meeting was about the role of TERENA in supporting exchange of information among NRENs in network service innovation. The initial reaction was lukewarm but following from individual talks with representatives of TERENA member organisations it was agreed that TERENA would start looking into convening a Network Architects Workshop. Christoph added that TERENA secretariat staff had started to look into the options. Lars remarked that time was ripe to start and it was agreed to go ahead as planned.

2. Requirements of international e-science user groups, how NRENs and TERENA should respond to them?

David Kelsey and Licia Florio introduced the discussion. David started by reporting on a paper he had co-authored and that was discussed at the REFEDS meeting on Sunday 20 May in Reykjavik. The "Federated Identity Management for Research Collaborations" paper (<https://cdsweb.cern.ch/record/1442597>) was discussing especially open issues, common vision and recommendations in support of dynamic collaborations that cross organisational and national boundaries.

Licia built on the highlights presented by David and focused on the issues, what was the status of the discussion in REFEDS so far and possible developments. The primary issue was that whilst Identity Federations were built with definite national boundaries, the needs of international research users are clearly global in scope. Major issues for eScience are related to

scalability. These thoughts triggered some reflections about the flexibility of federations and if they should facilitate access to different services. Some participant questioned whether eScience users really have all those requirements.

Andrew Cormack remarked that Federations were defined as lightweight organisations so that all the hard stuff could be solved at the IdP and SP level.

Mikael Linden said there was good understanding of requirements from the paper, but signalled also issues of inconsistent policies at federations.

Christoph Witzig felt that this seems to provide a very good case for inter federation.

Licia, suggested that REFEDS should at least define a roadmap and create a working group to address those user needs. Christoph Witzig argued that more is needed. Licia and Valentino thought that some of the issues related to how to resource the work should be investigated further. Licia agreed to get back to the REFEDS community propose a roadmap and try to estimate the resources needed.

There was some question whether REFEDS is the right body to coordinate that work but it was generally felt that this was the case. Some participant asked whether the GN3+ project could be a source of resources. The general feeling was that developments to address the eResearch community could not wait that much and it was essential to start moving fast.

Conclusion: REFEDS/TERENA should promptly start working with the eResearch community and identify pilot projects; discuss and agree on a clear mandate to REFEDS for authoring use cases. Also try to estimate the required resources.

3. Collaboration on security infrastructure in addition to TF-CSIRT is there a gap for TERENA to close?

Christoph Graf reported that TERENA has been running TF-CSIRT for over a decade, that meetings had reached very large numbers of participants and the "CERT model" had expanded in other sectors beyond research and education networking, including governments, banks and the commercial sector at large.

Christoph listed a number of known topics of interest to security experts, which include IR (Incident Response) and AA (Authentication and Authorisation); topics which are well covered by TERENA. Baiba Kaskina suggested that secure-coding should be added to the list of topics. Anyway, Christoph argued that there's more to security than incident response and AA. Christoph remarked that Chief Security Officers are aware of this and it would be right time to identify those CSOs in the NREN community, talk with them to identify topics of common interest and see whether there is scope for TERENA to support any collaboration activity.

Conclusion: Make a call for a meeting of NREN CSOs adjacent to a TF-CSIRT – exploring the issue with the community to see if it makes sense or not for TERENA to start a new collaboration activity.

List of Participants

Claudio Allocchio	GARR
Kristine Andersone	SigmaNet
Lajos Balint	NIIF/Hungarnet
Bartosz Belter	PSNC
Ulrich Berger	Nokia Siemens Networks
Marko Bonac	Arnes
Thomas Brunner	SWITCH
Maciej Brzeźniak	PSNC
Valentino Cavalli	TERENA
Andrew Cormack	Janet
Ajay Daryanani	RedIRIS
Tomas De Miguel	RedIRIS
John Dyer	TERENA
Antônio Carlos F. Nunes	RNP
Joao Nuno Ferreira	FCCN
Jan Ferré	deic
Lars Fischer	NORDUnet
Licia Florio	TERENA
David Foster	CERN
Victoriano Giralt	University of Málaga/Confía
Vicente Goyanes	University of Vigo / Campus do Mar
Christoph Graf	SWITCH
Leandro Guimarães	RNP
Laurent Gydé	RENATER
Roland Hedberg	Umeå University
Josh Howlett	Janet
Richard Hughes-Jones	DANTE
Avgust Jauk	Arnes
Sæþór L. Jónsson	University of Iceland / RHnet
Baiba Kaskina	SigmaNet
Peter Kaufmann	DFN
David Kelsey	STFC
Andrea Kropacova	CESNET
Gitte Kudsk	UNI-C/Forskningsnettet
Harri Kuusisto	Funet / CSC
Mikael Linden	CSC - It Center for Science
Diego Lopez	Telefonica
Jan Meijer	UNINETT
Kevin Meynell	TERENA
Miroslav Milinovic	Srce
Yannis Mitsos	GRNET
Janos Mohacsi	NIIF/Hungarnet
Per Nihlen	SUNET

Brian Nisbet	HEAnet
Mark O'Leary	Janet
Christian Panigl	ACOnet
Eli Peleg	IUCC
Alberto Perez	RedIRIS
Janice Ribeiro	RNP
Victor Reijs	HEAnet
Jan Růžička	CESNET
Afrodite Sevasti	GRNet
Zvonimir Stanić	CARNet
Helmut Sverenyák	CESNET
Peter Szegedi	TERENA
Manfred Wiegand	Nokia Siemens Networks
Klaas Wierenga	Cisco Systems
Stefan Winter	RESTENA
Christoph Witzig	SWITCH
Andy Zbinden	SWITCH