**Notes – GNA-G Community VCs – Q1 2021**

Version: 0.9

Dates: 15 & 16 March 2021

Participants:

* VC#1: 53 (max. number)
* VC#2: 34 (max. number)
1. **Opening & Welcome**

David opened the VCs and welcomed all. The agenda was approved.

1. **Updates from the GNA-G Leadership Team**

Slides at:[**https://nordunet.box.com/s/z4l9nz2owdl36na76unxuxr6hbki4qqb**](https://nordunet.box.com/s/z4l9nz2owdl36na76unxuxr6hbki4qqb)

* 1. **Leadership Team Statutes**

Erik-Jan introduced the proposal for the Leadership Team Statutes, and opened the floor for questions and comments:

* Migiel asked how to submit comments? Please feel free to send them to the GNA-G mailing list or to Leadership Team.
* Rob V. proposed to charge the NomCom explicitly to look for diversity.
* Tim C. suggested to work with a NomCom larger than three persons. Also, Tim proposed to allow for a comments period after announcing candidates.
* Celeste mentioned that many organizations allow two terms as a maximum and then there needs to be a break for that person for, e.g., two years before person can serve again, and propose to add that.

Erik-Jan thanked all for their comments, and announced there to be a new version of the Leadership Team Statutes soon.

* 1. **Managing WGs**

David introduced the topic of how we manage WGs, how we create and wind them up, and mentioned that good ideas welcome. This generated the following comments and suggestions:

* Rob E. proposed to add the creation and winding down of WGs to the website, and also to send a note to the mailing list.
* Tim C. mentioned that IETF has a well working process for starting a WG: First, you need to run a BoF. See RFC5434 for running a successful WG.
* Lars F. added that the RDA have a similar model for requiring one or two BoFs.
	1. **Diversity Statement & Code of Conduct**

Gerben mentioned that the GNA-G Diversity Statement was put online earlier this year. This means that we took the first step. The next step coming to a set up Guidelines for Conduct. The Leadership Team created a first version. Gerben elaborated on the items covered in this version:

1. Extend respect and courtesy
2. Constructive discussions
3. Solutions
4. Preparedness to contribute

Gerben continued on what happens if there is transgression, with a resolution system involving WG chair(s), the Leadership Team, and the Executive Liaison. Comments are welcome to this draft.

1. **Innovation Corner**
	1. **Open-sourcing of the Workflow Orchestrator**

John MacAuley (ESnet), Migiel de Vos (SURF), and Hans Trompert (SURF) gave an in-depth update on the work of ESnet and SURF on the Workflow Orchestrator.

Video at: <https://nordunet.box.com/s/cwxywsy5r8dca9qlgujjd0zxsts1t3pq>

Migel mentioned an activity in the GN4-3 Project; Tim C. shared the link:

<https://www.geant.org/Resources/Documents/GN4-3_White-Paper_SURFnet-OAV-Architecture-Analysis.pdf>

Questions in the Zoom chat:

* Harvey: Comment on the use of binary versus SOAP services. Answer from Migiel: SOAP specs leave a lot of things open for interpretation, so from the orchestrators point of view we’ve decided to use a more succinct and easy to read setup. Northbound we will still support the known SOAP implementation. Harvey’s comment: Ok yes - In 2010-11 we developed systems for HEP workflow and switched to binary services in a multiuser environment because of the performance advantage. At that time it was a factor of 1500. Perhaps the translator to gRPC mentioned can help with that? Migiel: I guess you’ll only experience real speed improvements when you only use gRPC instances (without the SOAP translation) in that case… But feel free to have a look at what we have published so far (not finished): <https://github.com/workfloworchestrator/PolyNSI>
* Tim C.: Wondering how off the shelf the implementation was for ESnet, some (short) report on that would be interesting. Answer from Migiel: We can ask ESnet to give an update on that Tim :-). Tim: That would be good.
* David: I have a question for Migiel - is he happy that they chose to replace Activiti and write their own, or did that turn out to be harder than they expected? Gerben: we’re very happy with the replacement of Activiti, because 1) it was GUI-based and 2) Python gives us all flexibility to map and extend our production services, as well as making the platform open for the community.
	1. **RARE P4 Testbed**

Frédéric Loui (RENATER) elaborated on the work on the RARE P4 Testbed, part of GN4-3.

Slides: xxx

Frédéric mentioned that they are using the FreeRTR suite, the best you can get now. The platform has streaming telemetry and NetConf. This is for production. Switches are not cheap but affordable.

Frederic: For people interested in BIER last week we did a presentation @ IETF110 BIER-WG:

<https://youtu.be/gXyk-8ZdaCU?t=1719>

1. **Working Group Updates and Discussion**
	1. **Update on Security WG**

Charles Sterner (AARNet) gave an update on the work of the Security WG, that kicked off after the Q4 2020 Community VCs.

Charles highlighting that the overall of the WG is: Making the GREN a more secure place. Compliance as the first thing: MANRS alignment.

Comment from Warrick: If anyone has any questions on MANRS, be it deployment or compliance, please reach out to Warrick <warrick.mitchell@aarnet.edu.au> or Andrew Gallo at GWU <agallo@gwu.edu>, the global chairs for MANRS.

Charles continued that the WG is looking into sharing specific indicators. For this, they have an agreement. Currently, AARNet, Jisc, OmniSOC, and CANSSOC are the initial partners of this sharing agreement. The partners use a follow-the-sun principle to have each other’s back.

Charles also elaborated on capacity building and not trying to reinvent the wheel. Charles ended with: If you have a SOC, please join the WG.

* 1. **Plan for a new WG on Routing Anomalies**

Jennifer Schopf (Indiana U) presented the plan for a new WG on Routing in the GREN.

Slides: <https://nordunet.box.com/s/epeaua4vqzfu7vw69ocs0qrxyits1pcx>

Over the last years, NRENs have added a lot of additional resilience to the global interconnect for R&E. As a consequence, routing is messed up and we see a lot of ineffective routes. The plan is to put together a group to address routing inefficiencies. This is also to address R&E traffic over commercial networks, that could have taken an R&E path. The proposed WG will have two tracks:

1. Engineering
2. Policy

The idea is to start with Tool Talks, as a level setting exercise.

Matt Z. asked for the proposed Routing WG charter. Jennifer: The draft charter can be accessed online here: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/19xopar9QTtNAgUVT6t3KvvSAHMjXmif3KyIGmMooHs0/edit?usp=sharing>

The Leadership Team is currently evaluating the draft charter.

* 1. **Network Automation WG**

Warrick Michell (AARNet) & Migiel de Vos (SURF) presented the current state of the Network Automation WG.

Video at: <https://nordunet.box.com/s/voien3st0hhprpfvzivbxdvmo2caqc7b>

John Graham asked if netbox and netpalm are in the list of tools. Warrick answered that everyone will be able to list their tools. AARNet is using netbox, so I will be mentioning it in my submission to the catalogue:

<https://www.geant.org/Resources/Documents/GN4-3_White-Paper-Orchestration-Automation-Virtualisation-Terminology-1.1.pdf>

Ivana remembered all that the GÉANT team is always open for input, so any suggestions can be sent to: oav@lists.geant.org

Alternatively, this (and many other white papers from the GÉANT project) can be found here: <https://www.geant.org/Resources/#white>

* 1. **Data Intensive Sciences WG**

Harvey Newman (Caltech) elaborated on the state of the DIS WG.

Video at: <https://nordunet.box.com/s/1xo8o7adyim18xrx50fynv12suybdsbj>

1. **Announcement of next VCs and Closure**

David announced the next GNA-G Community VCs, as follows:

* Monday, 14 June 2021: 2pm – 4pm UTC
* Tuesday, 15 June 2021: 7am – 9am UTC

After spending the full two hours of each VC to the max, David thanked all for their participation, with a special thanks to the presenters in the Innovation Corner, and expressed the wish to see all back at the Q2 2021 Community VCs.
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