

FIRE portfolio analysis June 2010

Scott Kirkpatrick Jacques Magen Dirk Trossen Jerker Wilander





FIRE facility development

PORTAL

- \circ Catalogue
- Discovery tools
- Deployment tools

0 ...

- Federation models
- \circ Top down
- \circ Bottom up





FIREWORKS Fire facility evolution



Define, simulate and control experiments



Federation models



FIREWORKS Challenges for test beds

- Create a user base
- Maintain interest in usage
- •Create sustainability of test beds
- Support heterogeneous federation of test beds
- Create collaboration on tools and methods

FIREWORKS Testing goals / project

User facing experiments/testing

PII (user innovation)

Core Networking research experiments OneLab2, Federica,Ofelia Applicationsexperiments/testing

Bonfire, Tefis, PII

Networking component experiments Crew, SmartSantander, Wisebed, OneLab2 Networking aspects experiments

N4C, Ecode, Perimeter

...

Architecture Studies

Vital++, Self-Net, Resume-net ...



IP-projects Call 5





Open calls – starting in 1 year

CREW	cognitive radio
OFELIA	open flow
TEFIS	services and cloud computing
BonFire	services and cloud computing
SmartSantander	sensor networks



Research projects using facilities





Recommendations FIREWORKS First steps for FIREstation

- 1. The common portal is important, with stepwise development. Possibly a need of multiple implementations.
- Fire shows progress in top-down federation (TEAGLE), while SFA (in FIRE + GENI) has shown potential for scalability in bottom-up federation. FIRE should address both strategies.
- 3. Open call project selection should also address heterogeneous federation. This must be based on project quality, implementation cost and goals of the individual facilities.
- 4. Support of benchmarking and repeatability of experiments must be encouraged.
- 5. Develop data sharing/interconnection supported by standards and shared tools.
- 6. Identify appropriate levels of user support and ensure that best practices are shared among projects