# Annex A: Proposal Template

Green highlighted areas to be filled

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| logofire-standardresolution |  |  | jaune |

Innovative Experiments by SMEs

Full title of the existing project you wish to join: Fed4FIRE: Federation for FIRE

Acronym of the existing project: Fed4FIRE

Grant agreement number of existing project: 318389

Type of instrument (Integrated project/Network of excellence): Integrated project

Full title of your project  
Acronym of your proposal (optional)

Date of preparation of your proposal: xx/yy/2016

Version number *(optional):*

Your organisation name: Your organisation name

Your organisation address: Your organisation address

Name of the coordinating person: Name of the coordinating person

Coordinator telephone number: Coordinator telephone number

Coordinator email: Coordinator email

(this will be the email address to which the Acknowledgement of Receipt will be sent)

1. **Project** Summary

(Maximum 300 words – summary of your proposed work)

Remark: The information in this section may be used in public documents and reports by the Fed4FIRE consortium.

1. Detailed Description and Expected Results (target length 3 to 6 pages)

This section describes the details on the planned experiment (what do you hope to obtain, how, why is it relevant). This section should also include all information with respect to the State-of-the-Art to show the innovative character of the experiment and the expected business impact. Suggested sections include:

* 1. Concept and objectives

*Describe in detail the objectives of your proposed experiment. These objectives should be those achievable within your proposed action, not through subsequent development. Preferably they should be stated in a measurable and verifiable form.*

* 1. Business impact

*Describe how this experiment may impact your business and product development by indicating the way how this experiment fits in your activities.*

*Having close contacts with possible end-users during this experimental phase might be used to illustrate the business impact of your experiment.*

* 1. Description of State-of-the-Art

*Describe in detail how this experiment compares to the State-of-the-Art in the field covered by the experiment. Are there similar experiments, products, services,.. on the market? Is this experiment incremental to existing work?*

* 1. Methodology and associated work plan

*Provide a workplan which eventually can be broken down into work packages[[1]](#footnote-1) (WPs). Provide clear goals and verifiable results and also a clear timing.*

1. Requested Fed4FIRE tools, testbeds and facilities (target length 1 page)

Please check the Fed4FIRE testbed or multiple testbeds which will be required for your experiment

Please use [www.fedfire.eu](http://www.fedfire.eu) to get details on the specific testbeds or [contact@fed4fire.eu](mailto:contact@fed4fire.eu).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Wired testbeds | | |
|  | Virtual Wall (iMinds) |  |
|  | PlanetLab Europe (UPMC) |  |
|  | Ultra Access (UC3M, Stanford) |  |
|  | 10G Trace tester |  |
|  | PL-LAB (PSNC) |  |
|  |  |  |
| Wireless testbeds | | |
|  | Norbit (NICTA) |  |
|  | w-iLab.t (iMinds) |  |
|  | NITOS (UTH) |  |
|  | Netmode (NTUA) |  |
|  | SmartSantander (UC) |  |
|  | FuSeCo (FOKUS) |  |
|  | PerformLTE (UMA) |  |
|  | IRIS (TCD) |  |
|  | LOG-a-TEC (JSI) |  |
|  | C-Lab (UPC) |  |
|  |  |  |
| OpenFlow testbeds | | |
|  | UBristol OFELIA island |  |
|  | i2CAT OFELIA island |  |
|  | Koren testbed (NIA) |  |
|  | NITOS testbed |  |
|  |  |  |
| Cloud computing testbed | | |
|  | EPCC and Inria cloud sites, members of the BonFIRE multi-cloud testbed for services experimentaiton |  |
|  | iMinds Virtual Wall testbed for emulated networks in BonFIRE |  |
|  | Norbit Exogeni testbed (Nicta) |  |
|  |  |  |
| Other | | |
|  | FIONA (Adele robots): creating virtual interaction robots |  |
|  | Tengu (iMinds): big data analysis framework |  |

Please provide here more information on why specific testbeds will be required for your experiment (max. ½ page)

1. Compliance check (max. 1 page)

This section contains the feedback from the Fed4FIRE partner acting as patron on this experiment regarding the obligatory compliance check.

Each proposing party must contact the Fed4FIRE consortium regarding its submission to identify a possible Patron. This Patron will in most cases be the Fed4FIRE partner responsible for the Testbed the proposing SME will use during its experiment. The proposing party must submit its draft proposal to this Patron by 02 March 2016 The feedback by the Patron is copied into this section of the proposal.

It is advised you get as soon as possible in contact with the Fed4FIRE in charge of the testbeds you intend to use and discuss with him/her your proposal.

1. Background and qualifications (target length 1-2 pages)

This section describes the proposing SME and includes an overview of the activities, your qualifications, technical expertise and other information to allow the reviewers to judge your ability to carry out the experiment.

1. Expected feedback to the Fed4FIRE Consortium (target length 1-2 pages)

This section contains valuable information for the Fed4FIRE consortium and should indicate the expected feedback the Fed4FIRE consortium can expect form the use of its federated facilities after carrying out your experiment. This information is essential in view of the sustainability of the facilities and use of tools and procedures. Note that the production of this feedback is one of the key motivations for the existence of the Fed4FIRE open calls.

1. Requested funding (1 page)

This section provides an overview of the budgeted costs and the requested funding. A split is made in personnel costs and other costs (travel, consumables,..).

Besides the table below, extra information can be provided to support the requested funding and which may help to judge the cost to the Fed4FIRE project.

*Please show your figures in euros (not thousands of euros)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total PM** | **Cost** |
| 1. Personnel costs |  |  |
| 2. Other costs | |  |
| 3. Total costs (Sum of row 1 and 2) | |  |

In row 1, insert your personnel costs for the work involved.

In row 2, insert any other costs, for example equipment or travel costs.

In row 3, calculate the sum of your personnel and other costs.

The maximum funding which is allowed in this call is set at 15 000 euro per experiment.

1. Survey & Use of proposal information

*Proposals are treated in a confidential way, meaning that only successful proposals may be disclosed to the Fed4FIRE consortium. Open calls previously organized by other FIRE projects were very successful and have revealed that many submitted non-granted proposals also contain very interesting and valuable information that could be used for setting up collaborations or to extract ideas for further improving the federated test infrastructures. Therefore the project would like to have the opportunity to collect more detailed information and further use this information, also if the proposal is not selected for funding. In any case, the Fed4FIRE consortium will treat all information of this proposal confidentially. Three types of information usage are envisaged:*

* *Information which is part of the Sections A, C, D and F will be used within the Fed4FIRE project as input for tasks related to architectural optimizations, sustainability studies, etc. The same information can also be used in an anonymous way to create statistics and reports about this first open call. All proposals submitted to this competitive open call are obliged to allow this form of information access and usage.*
* *Other information belonging to this proposal might also be accessed by the Fed4FIRE consortium if allowed by the corresponding consortium. Any use of such information will be discussed and agreed upon with the proposers. Proposals have the freedom to select if they wish to support this kind of information usage.*
* *As part of the submission of your proposal, and in support of the Fed4FIRE-project itself, a survey needs to be completed (Section I). This survey consists of a list of specific requirements which you expect your experiment has for our federated testbeds. Please be informed that the survey has been set up in general terms and some of the questions may not apply to your experiment. This survey and its responses are intended for internal use within the Fed4FIRE-project and for the collection of information in view of the Fed4FIRE deliverables and reports. The survey and its responses will NOT be forwarded to the reviewing panel and will therefore have NO impact on the evaluation process.   
  This survey is an integral part of your proposal and proposals submitted without completing the on-line survey will not be eligible.   
  The survey consists of a template available in Section I that needs to be completed.*

*The proposers are therefore asked to include the following statements below in their proposal and tick the corresponding boxes.*


|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I allow that the material provided in Sections A, C, D and F of this proposal may be accessed by the Fed4FIRE consortium, also if the proposal is not selected for funding. In any case, the Fed4FIRE consortium will treat all this information confidentially. It will be used within the Fed4FIRE project as input for tasks related to architectural optimizations, sustainability studies, etc. The same information can also be used in an anonymous way to create statistics and reports about this first open call. |  | YES |  |  |
| Furthermore, I allow that the other parts of this proposal may be accessed by the Fed4FIRE consortium, also if the proposal is not selected for funding. In any case, the Fed4FIRE consortium will treat all information of this proposal confidentially. Any use of this information will be discussed and agreed upon with the proposers. |  | YES |  | NO |

1. Questions to experimenters

## Part A – Sustainability

Fed4FIRE wants to become a sustainable federation. We are identifying the key factors for our success and we hope for your collaboration in helping us prioritise our next moves so that we can serve you better. The questionnaire included in this section is therefore designed in such a way that it can help us understand which aspects are more valuable to you.

The next picture shows some ideas of how we may bring a valuable service to you. Please take a moment to go through it before completing the following survey.



**In the survey table below, we would like to assess which aspects of the federation are perceived as most valuable by our experimenters**. The Value column should be filled in as follows:

**X = no opinion or not applicable to your experiment/ environment  
1=not valuable 2=nice side-effect 3=important value 4=Very important value**

| ***Thanks to Fed4FIRE, I …*** | **Value**  **(X or 1..4)** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| … have access to a large and ideal set of different technologies (sensors, computing, network, etc.), provided by a large amount of testbeds. This way I can experiment with edge technology in all current research trends. |  |  |
| … have access to resources that otherwise would not be affordable. |  |  |
| … have access to testbeds that are geographically distributed. |  |  |
| … the user experience is that I only have to deal with a single service provider (i.e. single point of contact and service) instead of dealing with each testbed on my own. This relates to many aspects of experimentation such as authentication, learning about available resources, reserving those resources, controlling them during the experiment, getting the results out of your experiment, hiring training services, getting support, etc. |  |  |
| … can experiment using a small set of common well-documented experimenter tools. This brings me several benefits: simplicity (since those tools can hide many of the testbeds’ complexities), a single federated interface, a uniform input/output from different systems, and allows me to use a single user account while experimenting with resources over all these different testbeds. All these benefits result in a lower entry barrier, allowing me to experiment quickly, without investing much effort in learning how to work with a plethora of different tools for the different testbeds. |  |  |
| … can reduce the effort required to experiment and hence to take my product to the market (since the federation provides me easy access to the resources at the different testbeds, and user-friendly experimenter tools as described above). |  |  |
| … have access to a wider experimenters community. This leads to a greater impact of results, shared dissemination and the possibility to share experience and knowledge with other experimenters. |  |  |
| … acquire new competences to, e.g., optimize my solutions. This way I can increase my own technical scope and competiveness. |  |  |
| … have a trustworthy environment for my experiments: my data is protected and the privacy of me and my experiment is guaranteed. |  |  |
| … can experiment in a controlled environment where experiments are repeatable. This allows the thorough execution of performance assessments and allows easy comparison of results. |  |  |
| … feel that I pick what I need beyond my initial ideas because of the greater choice in facilities and resources, which leads to greater inspiration (supermarket effect). |  |  |
| … can experiment in a unique environment for experimentation that goes beyond the lab environment and enables real world implementation. |  |  |
| … have the support I need to successfully complete my experiment: the federation provides a federation-wide First Level Support Service (hotline), and I can get in touch with the experts of every testbed using the same mechanism. |  |  |
| … have service level guarantees concerning the facilities used in my experiment (availability during my experiment, incident solving time,…) |  |  |

The above table concerns characteristics of the federation that we already identified as potentially being of value to our experimenters. In those cases it is sufficient to gather feedback about how valuable they are in reality for our experimenters. However, regarding some other aspects there is more indistinctness within the project. Therefore the second part of this sustainability section of this experimenter survey adopts the format of open questions. **Hence we would like to ask you to answer the following questions.**

1. **Why do you want to join the open call?** Is this mainly to receive funding for doing your research about a specific topic that is on your roadmap today? Is this because you want to get some experience with Fed4FIRE resources to be able to use them again in the future for other topics? Do you have other reasons?

*<Please type your answer here>*

2. **Would you propose an experiment without the funded open call?** In other words, would you also be interested in experimenting on Fed4FIRE in an unfunded open access scheme? Why (not)?

*<Please type your answer here>*

3. The federation provides several measures to lower the barrier for an experimenter as much as possible: you can experiment with all the offered resources using the same small set of common tools, detailed documentation is provided, you only need a single user account to experiment on al testbeds, there is a First Level Support service, etc. **Which of these things should the federation at least offer to allow experimentation without funding?** Are there any other items that the federation should provide to make it feasible to experiment on our facilities without receiving any funding for doing so?

*<Please type your answer here>*

4. Currently we support the experimenters with a First Level Support service (hotline) operated by the same people that operate the NOC of the Géant network. Next to that we provide an active community forum where experimenters can easily get in contact with experts of all the Fed4FIRE testbeds for advanced online support. **Are there any other kinds of support that you would expect from the federation, which is not available today?** For instance should the federation provide some kind of consultancy service that can guide you through every step of the process of transforming your idea into an actual successful experiment? Would you be willing to pay for that consultancy service (e.g. instead of paying for the usage of the resources). Can you think of any other additional support that we could offer?

*<Please type your answer here>*

## Part B – Requirements

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | |  | |  |
|  | The goal of this part of the survey is to get a feeling of the requirements that your experiment imposes on the Fed4FIRE federation of testbeds. For the listed requirements we are mainly trying to prioritize requirements that are already on our radar, based on what our potential experimenters really need. Next to those requirements, we are very keen to receive any new requirement that you can think of that also needs to be fulfilled when supporting your experiment. For this we have created the possibility to add as many new requirements as you see fit.  The questions of this part of the survey are presented in different tables, clustered around the different steps that an experimenter has to go through when running an actual experiment. In every of those tables, the Priority column should be filled in as follows:  **X = no opinion or not applicable to your experiment/ environment 1=not required 2=nice to have 3=important 4=must have**   * 1. Requirements related to resource discovery   The requirements listed in this table are all related to the very first thing that an experimenter does: learning about the different testbeds, and about which specific resources that they can offer. | | | | |
|  | **When discovering the different resources that Fed4FIRE can offer me for my experiment, I require …** | **Priority (X or 1-4):** | | **Comments and further details** | |
| 1-1 | That I can browse some kind of resource catalogue to look for appropriate resources on a high level. Such a catalogue is limited to information such as: testbed X is a testbed for WiFi experiments in an office environment, testbed Y is a testbed for testing cloud applications, etc. |  | |  | |
| 1-2 | That Fed4FIRE provides a detailed view on what node capabilities are available on every testbed of the federation (e.g. mentioning information for every resource of a testbed regarding CPU speed, RAM, supported 802.11 technology, optical networking interfaces, etc). |  | |  | |
| 1-3 | That the above view on node capabilities is the same across the different testbeds of the federation. This means that when describing the characteristics of resources, all testbeds should adopt the same units (e.g. represent RAM always in MB, and not sometimes in MB and sometimes in GB) and use the same parameter names for aspects that mean the same (e.g. always talk about “RAM”, and not “RAM” on some testbeds, “working memory” on some others and just “memory” on a third group of testbeds). |  | |  | |
| 1-4 | That next to browsing through information about what is available, that I can actively search for the existence of resources with certain characteristics by defining a specific query (e.g. something that is similar to an SQL query, e.g. select resources from all testbeds where RAM >= 8 GB) |  | |  | |
| 1-5 | That I know the location of the site where resources are located. Per site, this location information can be exactly the same for all resources. |  | |  | |
| 1-6 | That for nodes that have static network connections to other nodes in the same testbed, that it should be possible to identify the corresponding physical topology. In the wired domain this means that you can know how the nodes are connected to each other. For wireless resources this means that you know which resources are in transmission range of each other. |  | |  | |
| 1-7 | That I have accurate location information about the actual resources that I will use (1 m accuracy), typically important for wireless nodes. |  | |  | |
| 1-8 | For virtual resources, that I know their physical host and the actual location. |  | |  | |
| 1-9 | That I can assess which testbeds/resources are more reliable then others (both in terms of provided hardware, software, and wireless interference, possibly based on historical health information about the resources and their environment) |  | |  | |
| 1-10 | *If you have any additional requirements regarding resource discovery, please insert them here. Create as many new rows in this table as needed.* |  | |  | |
| 1-11 |  |  | |  | |
| 1-12 |  |  | |  | |
| 1-13 |  |  | |  | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | * 1. Requirements related to resource selection and reservation   Once an experimenter has learned which resources are available at every testbed, he/she can then design its experiment appropriately. When setting up the corresponding experiment, the first thing that needs to be done is selecting resources to be included in the experiment, and reserving them for the experiment for a certain moment in time. | | |
|  | **When selecting and reserving resources that I want to include in my Fed4FIRE experiment, I require …** | **Priority (X or 1-4):** | **Comments and further details** |
| 2-1 | That when browsing through the resource descriptions, that I can manually select every node that should be added to my experiment. Think of an experience similar to online shopping and putting resources in your shopping cart. |  |  |
| 2-2 | That I can select suitable resources for inclusion in my experiment by defining a specific query (e.g. something that is similar to an SQL query, e.g. select all resources from Virtual Wall where nr\_ethernet\_cards >= 6) |  |  |
| 2-3 | That I can temporarily install my own equipment at a Fed4FIRE testbed for testing, and select it to be included in my experiment. |  |  |
| 2-4 | That the mechanism for registering my own equipment at a testbed is standardized, allowing me to register that equipment at different testbeds in exactly the same manner. |  |  |
| 2-5 | That I can reserve resources. It is OK for me that they are shared with others (soft reservation, e.g. requesting a virtual machine that will be deployed on a physical server that is used by other experiments also), as long as I know that I will also have guaranteed access to them. |  |  |
| 2-6 | That I can reserve resources. They have to be exclusively assigned to me (hard reservation, e.g. reserving a virtual machine that will be deployed on a physical machine that is dedicated to your experiment only) |  |  |
| 2-7 | That next to adding resources to my experiment right now (instant reservation), that I can also define a reservation for any moment in the future (future reservation, e.g. tomorrow from 9AM-5PM). |  |  |
| 2-8 | That situations are avoided where a have to wait days or weeks before being able to use the testbed because of long reservations of others. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2-9 | That I can reserve nodes exclusively for myself for a longer period (days or weeks) |  |  |
| 2-10 | That a reservation is approved or rejected quickly (within a few minutes). |  |  |
| 2-11 | That I can easily reserve resources across multiple testbeds using the same common tools. These should also be as user-friendly as possible, abstracting the complexity of the underlying infrastructures for me as much as possible. This way I can focus on the experiment design itself instead of learning how to work with numerous testbed-specific tools. |  |  |
| 2-12 | That when reserving resources across multiple testbeds, that there is guidance in finding the first appropriate time when all the resources that I want across the testbeds would all be available. |  |  |
| 2-13 | That I can use a single Fed4FIRE account to select and reserve resources at all different testbeds of the federation. So even when using one common tool for reservation at the different testbeds, I don’t want to remember a different username/password combination for every testbeds, and I also don’t want to register again at every testbed that I want to use. Of course, registering for that one Fed4FIRE account should also be straightforward. |  |  |
| 2-14 | That if testbeds decide to assign me a certain reservation quota (e.g. based on my profile such as student, post-doc, professor, paying customer, etc), that I can request a temporary increase of my quota if really need it (e.g. before a paper deadline) |  |  |
| 2-15 | That the testbeds and/or the federation guarantee a certain Service Level to me regarding the execution of my experiment (availability of resources, reliability of resources (uptime/downtime), responsiveness of support services, privacy guarantees, etc). |  |  |
| 2-16 | That I can dynamically scale my resources up and down according that what my experiment needs during its execution. For instance if a server deployed on a VM gets overloaded, I should be able to assign more resource (RAM, CPU cores, etc.) to that running VM, and/or should be able to add a second VM to my running experiment on which I deploy a second instance of that server. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2-17 | That if I reserved a number of resources at a testbed, that I can divide them over different independent experiments that I am doing at the same time. It should be possible to easily address/group the resources from one experiment. |  |  |
| 2-18 | *If you have any additional requirements regarding resource selection and reservation, please insert them here. Create as many new rows in this table as needed.* |  |  |
| 2-19 |  |  |  |
| 2-20 |  |  |  |
| 2-21 |  |  |  |
| 2-22 |  |  |  |

* 1. Requirements related to using the resources (deployment and basic usage)

Once an experimenter has added the resources to the experiment, the next step is the deployment of those resources for that experiment, and basic usage of the resources. This section tries to capture the corresponding requirements.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **When using the resources that I included in my Fed4FIRE experiment, I require …** | **Priority (X or 1-4):** | **Comments and further details** |
| 3-1 | That I can SSH to my nodes. |  |  |
| 3-2 | That I have root access to my nodes. This allows me to perform any action on the nodes that I want (install new applications, device drivers, load additional kernel modules, etc). |  |  |
| 3-3 | That I can use a single public/private SSH key pair to access my resources on all the different testbeds |  |  |
| 3-4 | That I can choose to have Windows installed on my nodes |  |  |
| 3-5 | That I can choose to have a specific Linux distribution on my nodes (e.g. latest Ubuntu LTS release) |  |  |
| 3-6 | That I can choose to use a custom Linux kernel on my nodes (e.g. with my own performance upgrade patches to the kernel) |  |  |
| 3-7 | That my nodes can download and install software from the Internet (e.g. using a package manager) |  |  |
| 3-8 | That I can take a binary image of the hard drive of my nodes, and that I can store these for later re-use (so flashing the image back later on) |  |  |
| 3-9 | That I can define what a node should automatically do at startup (bootstrap scripts) |  |  |
| 3-10 | That during the deployment of my resources over different facilities, that my initial data sets can be automatically loaded to all these resources. |  |  |
| 3-11 | That I can allow other people of my work team that are involved in the experiment to use the resources that I have reserved and deployed. I should be able to specify which resources should be shared, and which not. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3-12 | That I can easily use my resources across multiple testbeds using the same common tools. These should be as user-friendly as possible, abstracting the complexity of the underlying infrastructures for me as much as possible. This way I can focus on the experiment itself instead of learning how to work with numerous testbed-specific tools. |  | Any input regarding which aspects of an experiment the tool should take care of for you are very welcome here (configuring a network node with a specific profile, etc). |
| 3-13 | *If you have any additional requirements regarding resource usage, please insert them here. Create as many new rows in this table as needed.* |  |  |
| 3-14 |  |  |  |
| 3-15 |  |  |  |
| 3-16 |  |  |  |

* 1. Requirements related to orchestrated control of the experiment

In the previous step resources were deployed, and the experiment can manually log in on them and control what they should do. However, when aiming to perform more advanced scenarios, where many resources are included and all of them should be triggered to perform certain task at the appropriate time, more orchestrated experiment control is needed. The corresponding requirements are captured in this section.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **When controlling the execution of my experiment in an orchestrated manner, I require …** | **Priority (X or 1-4):** | **Comments and further details** |
| 4-1 | That I can define the behaviour over time of a distributed experiment in a single script, which can be started automatically at any desired moment, and will be automatically translated to the corresponding triggers at the nodes at the appropriate time.  So e.g. describing in a single script that the 5 client nodes in an experiment should gradually increase their load on the server that they are testing in the experiment. This will be done automatically, without the experimenter login in to these 5 nodes and gradually increasing this load manually. |  |  |
| 4-2 | That I can define the behaviour of a distributed experiment in a single script, based on events (e.g. value above threshold). This can be started automatically at any desired moment, and will be automatically translated to the corresponding triggers at the nodes at the appropriate moment.  So e.g. describing in a single script that a server should scale up to a VM with more CPU power and RAM when the load of the clients on the server becomes higher than a certain threshold. |  |  |
| 4-3 | That the description of the above orchestration is described in a human-readable way. This description should also be uniform across the different testbeds. |  |  |
| 4-4 | That the above description of the orchestrated control of the experiment can also include other aspects that will be performed automatically. This includes selection, reservation and deployment of resources; monitoring of the resources and collection of measurement data during the experiment. |  |  |
| 4-5 | *If you have any additional requirements regarding orchestrated experiment control, please insert them here. Create as many new rows in this table as needed.* |  |  |
| 4-6 |  |  |  |
| 4-7 |  |  |  |
| 4-8 |  |  |  |

* 1. Requirements related to the results of the experiment (monitoring and measuring data)

The motivation for every experiment is to learn something. For this it is needed that the appropriate monitoring data and experiment measurements are captured. This section grasps the corresponding requirements.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **When capturing the results of my experiment (monitoring and measuring data), I require …** | **Priority (X or 1-4):** | **Comments and further details** |
| 5-1 | That the internal clocks of resources across multiple testbeds are synchronized very accurately |  |  |
| 5-2 | That Fed4FIRE makes it easy for me to retrieve and store data that I measured during the runtime of the experiment. This means that it should be easy to store my measurement somewhere in a way that the data is clearly related to the experiment ID, but without needing to establish connections to certain databases manually from within my code, and without needing to know the specific experiment ID that belongs to my current experiment. |  |  |
| 5-3 | That by default some common characteristics of my resources are stored automatically for later analyses during experiment runtime (CPU load, free RAM, Tx errors, etc). |  |  |
| 5-4 | That for the above monitoring, that I can select and configure how this data should be collected (always at a specified interval, only after a certain event or alarm, define some specific filters, etc). |  |  |
| 5-5 | That I can request the monitoring solutions to provide me specific additional on-demand measurements of node characteristics to ease experiment development and debugging |  |  |
| 5-6 | That information about external wireless interference during the execution of my experiment is automatically provided for me. |  |  |
| 5-7 | That the overall health status of the different testbeds (testbed up or down, has free resources left, etc.) is continuously monitored by the federation, and that in case of issues I am informed of this. |  |  |
| 5-8 | That the overall health status of the different testbeds (testbed up or down, has free resources left, etc.) is continuously monitored by the federation, and that in case of issues the corresponding testbeds try to solve them asap. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5-9 | That other aspects related to the successful execution of my experiment are continuously monitored, and that I am automatically informed in case of any errors. Examples are: when a selected resource could not be instantiated, when there is a problem with the interconnectivity between the used testbeds, when a used testbed goes down during the experiment, when there is a sudden peak of wireless interference, etc. This might be important when analysing anomalies in the experiment results. |  |  |
| 5-10 | That when an error requiring manual intervention is reported to me as part of the previous step, that I am guided through the process for recovery. |  |  |
| 5-11 | That the overhead of any monitoring and measurement tool is minimal. These tools should have a negligible impact on the results of my experiment. |  |  |
| 5-12 | That I can store and access my experiment monitoring data and other measurements on a data service on the federation, which is accessible during the experiment (temporarily data storage by the federation) |  |  |
| 5-13 | That I can store and access my experiment monitoring data and other measurements on a data service on the federation, which is also accessible after the experiment (archiving of historical data by the federation) |  |  |
| 5-14 | That access to my stored data is properly secured. Experiments must be kept confidential if required, the privacy of experiments, data sets and results should be guaranteed. |  |  |
| 5-15 | That I can store experiment configurations in order to repeat experiments and compare results of different runs |  |  |
| 5-16 | That I can share my stored data with specific others (individuals and/or groups), or even make them publically available |  |  |
| 5-17 | That I am made aware if my storage capacity is running out. |  |  |
| 5-18 | *If you have any additional requirements regarding monitoring and measuring data, please insert them here. Create as many new rows in this table as needed.* |  |  |
| 5-19 |  |  |  |
| 5-20 |  |  |  |
| 5-21 |  |  |  |

* 1. Requirements related to the interconnectivity of the different testbeds

Fed4FIRE facilities are intended to allow experimentation with Future Internet techniques. And because Fed4FIRE is a federation of testbeds that enables experiments that included resources from different testbeds, the interconnectivity between the different testbeds is very important. This section enumerates the corresponding requirements.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **When focusing on the connectivity of the resources that will be included in my Fed4FIRE experiment, I require …** | **Priority (X or 1-4):** | **Comments and further details** |
| 6-1 | That resources at different testbeds are interconnected on layer 3 (IP) |  |  |
| 6-2 | That resources at different testbeds are interconnected on layer 2, or that such a layer 2 connection can be automatically created for me (in a way that all the underlying technical details are abstracted for me) |  |  |
| 6-3 | That I can know the type of interconnections that are available between the testbeds (layer 2 and/or layer 3, NAT or VPN included, dedicated direct link, connected through Géant with or without bandwidth reservation, connected over the public Internet, …) |  |  |
| 6-4 | That I can configure a specific bandwidth on the interconnections between the different testbeds used in my experiment. As long as the links behave as configured, I don’t really care what the testbed has to do behind the curtains to implement this (reserve guaranteed bandwidth in case of limited capacity on the interconnecting link, or limit the bandwidth in case of a high capacity on that same link). |  |  |
| 6-5 | That my resources are directly reachable, without any network address translation (NAT) or virtual private network (VPN) in between. So actually I require that all resources have a public IPv4 or IPv6 address. |  |  |
| 6-6 | That if an issue arises with the interconnection between my used testbeds, that I am automatically informed about this. |  |  |
| 6-7 | *If you have any additional requirements regarding monitoring and measuring data, please insert them here. Create as many new rows in this table as needed.* |  |  |
| 6-8 |  |  |  |
| 6-9 |  |  |  |
| 6-10 |  |  |  |

1. A work package is a major sub-division of the proposed work with a verifiable end-point - normally a deliverable or a milestone in the overall action. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)